The first Collection.

THE

Faith of One God,

Who is only the Father;

AND OF

One Mediator between God and Men,

Who is only the Man Christ Jesus;

AND OF ONE

Holy Spirit, the Gift (and sent) of God;

Asserted and Defended,

In Several Tracts contained in this Volume; the Titles whereof the Reader will find in the following Leaf.

And after that

A Preface to the whole, or an Exhortation to an Impartial and Free Enquiry into the Doctrines of Religion.

Acts 17. 11.

These were more Noble than those of Thessalonica, *in that they received the Word with all readiness of Mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so?*

London, Printed in the Year, 1691.

S. Bible, Verte 4 folia.

359109

The TITLES of the ſeveral TRACTS.

8/ 20/3/22 3 Vol.

A *Short Account of the Life of* John Bidle, *Maſter of Arts, with a Letter written by him to Sir* H. V. *a Member of the Honourable Houſe of Commons, aſſerting the Holy Spirit to be the chief of all Miniſtring Spirits,* &c. In 16 Pages.

XII *Arguments drawn out of the Scripture, wherein the commonly received Opinion, touching the Deity of the Holy Syirit, is clearly and fully refuted.* 1—16.

Together with the Expoſition of ſeveral Texts of Scripture alledged on that behalf, as Mat. 28. 19. 1 Joh. 5. 7. Acts 5. 3, 4, *&c.* In 16 Pages.

A Confeſſion of Faith touching the Holy Trinity, according to the Scripture. In 24 Pages. *With*

The Preface to it, ſhewing ſix great Evils of the Doctrine of Three Perſons in God.

The Teſtimonies of Irenæus, Juſtin Martyr, Tertullian, Novatianus, Theophilus, *and* Origen, (*who lived in the two Firſt Centuries after Chriſt was born, or thereabouts;*) *As alſo*

Of Arnobius, Lactantius, Euſebius, Hilary *and* Brightman; *concerning that one God, and the Perſons of the Holy Trinity: Together with Obſervations on the ſame.* In 30 Pages.

Some Notes ſhewing that the moſt excellent things attributed to Chriſt, are attributed to him as a Man; and that many things attributed to God, are alſo attributed to Moſes. Pag. 31, 32.

The Acts of the Great Athanaſius, *with Brief Notes on his Creed; and Obſervations on Dr.* Sherlock's *Vindication of the Trinity and Incarnation.* In 32 Pages.

Some

Some Thoughts upon the ſame, ſhewing wherein the Subſtance and Certainty of the Chriſtian Faith conſiſts. In 22 Pages.

A Brief Hiſtory of the Unitarians, *called alſo* Socinians, *in Four Letters; the Firſt gives their Arguments from Scripture, for the Unity of God, who is the Father only; the other three Letters give Anſwers to all Texts alledged to the contrary in the Order of Scripture. To which is added the Judgment of a Learned Gentleman upon the Peruſal, in a Letter to the Publiſher; containing in all* 51 Pages.

A Defence of the Brief Hiſtory, &c. *againſt Dr.* Sherlock's *Anſwer in his Vindication,* &c. *or Obſervations on the ſame.* In 55 Pages.

An Impartial Account of the Word Myſtery, *as it is taken in the Holy Scripture*; in 24 Pages.

Dr. Wallis's *Letter, touching the Doctrine of the Bleſſed Trinity, anſwered,* in 15 Pages.

Obſervations on the Four Letters of Dr. Wallis *concerning the Trinity, and the Creed of* Athanaſius, *in* 20 Pages.

An Exhortation to a free and impartial Enquiry into the Doctrines of Religion.

THoſe that have any belief or regard of Religion, believe too, that 'tis the moſt weighty and ſerious of Things; becauſe therein the Glory and Honour of GOD, and the Salvation of Souls, are concerned. Accordingly there are very few, if any at all, who make the leaſt doubt, that 'tis of very high Concernment to be of the Right Faith: and by how much the controverted Point of Faith, does more apparently and nearly relate to the Glory of GOD; by ſo much does every Perſuaſion or Sect, and every particular Man think himſelf intereſſed, to be truly informed about it. But as this is ſo, it may be obſerved alſo, that any Belief or Doctrine which has been long received, gains ſuch a Reputation, and Authority over the Minds of moſt Men, that they count it an Impiety, and at beſt an Affectation of Novelty; to call over and examine again the Grounds, on which it was received at firſt, as ſuch an Indubitable and Sacred Truth. This fatal Error makes ſome Men fly from, and abhor Information about ſuch Articles of their Faith: ſo that having once imbibed one ſuch Error, they reſolvedly live and die in it. Let us therefore conſider in this place, whether *a free and ſincere* Inquiry into the Particulars of that Religion, which we were taught before we were well capable of judging, be not every one's Duty and Wiſdom, as a Man, as a Chriſtian, and as a Proteſtant?

I may ſay, That this is one of thoſe Doubts, whereof the very putting of it, in proper and apt Words, is to reſolve it. For can any thing be more becoming of a Man, more agreeable to the Dignity or more apparently the Duty of our Rational Natures, than in our adult, advanced, and capable Years to believe, not becauſe we have been thus taught, but becauſe upon review and after trial, we are ſatisfied? Of all the Uſes for which our Reaſon was deſigned, this without peradventure was the principal; to make uſe of it chiefly and moſt of all, in Cauſes and Queſtions relating to the Eternal World, and to our Hopes and Intereſts therein; that is (as every one will confeſs) in the Cauſes and Queſtions of Faith and Religion. How can I expect that World, at the hands of GOD; if what I believe concerning him, or what I practiſe towards him, is only by hearſay or hap of Education, and in no degree by my own Diſquiſition, Obſervation or Induſtry? He, *before whom are all our ways*, will judge both us and them, becauſe they were the Actions of rational and free Creatures; if either we were not Rational or were not Free, He would not regard what we believ'd or what we did; but being both theſe, our Reward from him will be in exact proportion to the uſe we have made of our Reaſon and of our Liberty. Therefore he (or ſhe) that has made no uſe of his Reaſon, but abandon'd himſelf to the uncertain chance of Education, or the religion of the Times and Laws, which vary with every Age and every Country: ſuch Perſon (none I think can doubt) will at laſt be judged to be that idle and unprofitable Servant, who hid his Talent in a Napkin, and put not to uſe his Lord's Money: what

the reward of every ſuch Servant ſhall be, our Saviour has told us at *Mat.* 25. 30.

I am ſenſible however, that 'tis a certain Modeſty and Diffidence of themſelves, that makes ſome ſo cautious of Beliefs or Doctrines, new to them. They think themſelves not qualified to make a ſure Judgment; and therefore that by ſuch freedom of Inquiry (as I am perſuading) they do but hazard the exchanging an Opinion, recommended to them by the Providence of their Education, and by the ſweetneſs and ſafety that there is in Unity and Peace, for an Opinion that will (perhaps) bring perpetual Diſquiets, both into their Mind and Life; and after all, they cannot be certain that 'tis true; ſince they are not perfectly qualified, *to judge of all Allegations for and againſt it.* I confeſs this were to the purpoſe; if God or Reaſon required of us an infallible Judgment, or an abſolute Certainty within our ſelves; but theſe two belong to GOD alone, neither Men nor Angels can pretend to either of them. But becauſe only GOD is infallible, and has abſolute Certainty within himſelf, muſt Men or may Men believe all that has been taught them, without making ſuch trial as their Leiſure and their Abilities, whatever they be, ſerve them to make? What if our Abilities or Qualifications are not great, nay are ſmall; the Servant who had but one Talent intruſted to his management, was required to uſe that one Talent, no leſs than he who had five, and was puniſh'd for not doing it: Nor is Truth entailed on the Learned and the Wiſe, for we ſee that many ſuch are found in the moſt contrary Opinions; but 'tis (partly) a natural effect of, and (partly) the Gift of GOD upon, only a ſincere, free and impartial Inquiry. Truth, eſpecially religious Truth, is not ſo far from any of us, that the moſt Modeſt need to diſtruct their Sufficiency to enquire after it, and to find it out; if it were, it would not be required of any but the Learned and Wiſe to be of any Perſuaſion about Points that are diſputed among the Learned: And if ſo, none but Learned Men, none but ſuch as can *judge of all Allegations for and againſt the controverted Doctrines*, might be either Papiſts or Proteſtants, either Calviniſts or Remonſtrants, either Trinitarians or Unitarians. All will confeſs this to be abſurd, but it clearly follows, that whatever my Abilities or Qualifications are, I muſt uſe them: If they be ſmall, all my Errors will be pardonable, except thoſe that I took up on meer truſt, without examining at all the Grounds of them; that is, the Errors imbibed meerly from Education, from my Intereſts, Reverence of particular Men, from the Times or the Laws: Such Errors will not be pardoned, becauſe they were wholly our fault: we would not hear any thing againſt them, nor judge as well as we could (and more is not our Duty) concerning them. As for our Peace and Eaſe, the other part of the Objection; We know not God, nor believe that (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks) *He is a Rewarder of ſuch as diligently ſeek him*, if we prefer the intire Repoſe and Security of this Momentary Life, to the true Knowledg of Him and of his Will.

Well, but may I not take it for a ſufficient Proof of my Faith, and a ſufficient Anſwer to all Objections againſt it, that ſo many moſt Learned and Pious Men aſſert and defend it, againſt (perhaps) a few and obſcure Perſons, of no reputation (that I know of) for either? Is it not *a rational Prejudice* againſt ſuch and their Doctrines; that there is nothing ſo abſurd and impious, which Aſſecters of Singularity and Novelty, do not every day advance, and that I ſee ſuch as are moſt deſervedly eſteemed for Sobriety, Gravity, Sagacity, Experience, Learning and Probity, and all other Qualifications, do in the moſt ſerious and earneſt Manner declare againſt them? What if they are obſtinate and unreclamable; Whimſy and Affectation are better and ſooner cured by Phyſick or Puniſhment, than by Argument. Thus they are apt to argue, who would be eſteemed Prudent, while they are only Lazy and Cowardly. They pretend the Learning and Piety of others, as an excuſe for a blind or implicit Faith in what they have been taught by

by ſome ſuch. Do they not perhaps know, that no Sect whatever, can boaſt of ſuch Learned and Good Men, but that all other Sects have as Learned and Good? *Learning* is an Help both to diſcover and to defend Truth; but only *Freedom* and *Sincerity* are fit to be intirely truſted in that Search. The Learned (if you ſpeak of ſuch as are Prieſts or Miniſters, or Beneficed Men) have ſuch a Byaſs given to their Minds, by the awe of their Superiors, to whom they are accountable, by Fears of deprivation, in caſe of profeſſed Heterodoxy, by their Subſcriptions (before they were able to judg) to the Articles of their ſeveral Churches; that it may be ſaid, their Learning gives no Authority to their Opinions: 'tis plain enough, that their Opinions are ſuch, as the Conditions and Terms of Preferment (appointed by the Laws of the Countrey) do require of them; except when a Party is grown powerful enough to deſpiſe or to evade the Laws. The Learned Men of *Italy*, and in all the Dominions of *Spain*, are zealous and thorow Roman Catholicks; thoſe of *France* are Roman Catholicks, but with a reſerve to the Liberties of the Gallican Church, and the Regalities of the French Crown; in one Half of *Germany*, the Learned Men are Catholicks, in the other Half they are Reformed; the Learned Men of *Denmark* and *Swedland* are Lutherans, the Learned in the *Alps* are Calviniſts; of the Learned Men in *England*, ſome follow the Reformation by Arch-biſhop *Cranmer*, and other Compilers of the Common Prayer, others follow thoſe that ſettled firſt at *Frankford*, afterwards at *Geneva*. Does not this difference plainly ſhow us, that it is not Learning, but *Sincerity* and *Freedom* that qualifies Men, to judge of the Doctrines of Religion? Let their Superiours leave the Learned to a true Freedom; that there may be no Forfeiture incurred by every Man's profeſſing as he thinks, and then I will allow, that Learned Men are valuable Inſtruments towards the diſcovering and aſſerting of Truth. But while they are ſhackled by early Subſcriptions, hopes of Preferment, fears of Puniſhment, and the like Reſtraints, they are fitter to ſupport the Kingdom of Darkneſs and Error, than to revive the true Light and genuine Goſpel of our Lord Chriſt. But if ſtill the regard of Learning be ſo great with any Perſon, that he intirely ſurrenders up his Judgment to the Dictates of ſuch Men: I may tell ſuch an one, that the Unitarians have a particular Reputation, as moſt skilful in that which is the proper Learning of Divines, the ſacred Criticiſm; and are talk'd of by their Adverſaries, as a ſort of ſubtle, rational, and diſcerning Men: Particular Authors among them, *Eraſmus*, *Grotius*, *Epiſcopius*, *Curcellæus*, *Crellius*, *Ruarus*, *Chillingworth*, all of them known Unitarians, are by all granted to be in the firſt rank of Learned Men.

But what, was the Goſpel of our Dear Saviour written to the Learned and the Wiſe, to them only, or to them principally? *O Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, thou haſt hid theſe things from the Wiſe and Prudent, and haſt revealed them unto Babes*, Mat. 11. 25. *Where is the Wiſe, where is the Scribe, where is the Diſputer of this World?* —— *Seeing the World by Wiſdom* (*i. e.* by Learning) *knew not God, it pleaſed God by the fooliſhneſs of Preaching to ſave them that believe.* —— *See your Calling, Brethren, how not many Wiſe* (*i. e.* Learned) *Men after the Fleſh, are called.* —— *But God hath choſen the fooliſh things of the World, to confound the Wiſe; and God hath choſen the weak things of the World, to confound the things which are mighty; and baſe things of the World, and things which are deſpiſed, hath God choſen; yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things which are; that no Fleſh might glory in his Preſence*, 1 Cor. 1. 20, 26, 27, 28. The former of theſe Texts is ſpoken by our Saviour himſelf, the other are the Words of that Apoſtle, who was the only Learned Man choſen to be an Apoſtle. They are a Demonſtration, that the Truths of the Chriſtian Religion, are adapted and levelled to the meaneſt Capacities, and that an arrogant or prejudiced Learning and Wiſdom, do more commonly overſee thoſe Truths than imbrace them. When St. *Paul* ſaith, 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 21. *Prove all things, hold faſt that which is good:*

does

does he not plainly recommend *to the Church of the* Theſſalonians (ſee chap. 1. 1.) and not only to the Learned among them, that *free* and *ſincere* Inquiry, of which I am ſpeaking? When he commends the Jews of *Berea*, as *more Noble* than thoſe of *Theſſalonica*; becauſe *they ſearched the Scriptures daily, whether thoſe things* (*i. e.* the New Doctrines taught by St. *Paul*) *were ſo*, Acts 17. 11. he has thereby given to all free Inquirers, the Character of *Noble*, and pronounced all others to be baſe, ungenerous, ignoble, vile.

This is ſome part of what the Holy Scriptures ſay about this Matter. The truth is, they are ſo clear and expreſs in the caſe, that the firſt Reformers, and after them the Proteſtants of all Denominations and Sects, wherever they argue againſt the Papiſts, lay it down *as a Principle*; that none are to follow their Teachers, with an implicit or blind Faith. Every one, ſay they, is to uſe his own proper *Judgment of Diſcretion*; the Goſpel being plain and eaſy in all neceſſary Points both of Faith and Manners; there is no need of great Abilities, or of Learning, but only of Sincerity and a free unprejudiced Mind, to judge truly and to chooſe ſafely. This (all know) is the common Principle of all Proteſtants, and the very Ground or Foundation of the Reformation; take away this, and we muſt neceſſarily return again to *Rome*, and to the Dictates of Holy Mother-Church.

From all theſe Premiſes, I hope I may ſecurely infer and conclude; that *to prove all things, to try the Spirits, to ſearch the Scriptures*, is our Wiſdom as Men, our Duty as Chriſtians, our Principle and Profeſſion as Proteſtants; and that 'tis to un-man our ſelves, to apoſtatize from Chriſtianity, and to renounce the Reformation; if any be ſo impious, ſo diffident, or ſo ſluggiſh, as to believe without *Proving*, to imbrace without *Trying*, to acquieſce without *ſearching*. Reader, *I commend thee to GOD, and to the Word of his Grace, which is able to build thee up, and to give thee an Inheritance among all them which are ſanctified*, Acts 20. 32.

April 1. 1691.

THE

THE

APOSTOLICAL

And *True Opinion* concerning the

HOLY TRINITY,

Revived and Asserted:

Partly by Twelve ARGUMENTS levied against the Traditional and False Opinion about the *Godhead* of the *Holy Spirit.*

Partly by a CONFESSION of FAITH touching the Three Persons.

Both which having been formerly set forth, were much altered and augmented, with Explications of Scripture, and with Reasons:

And finally,

With TESTIMONIES of the FATHERS, And of Others.

All Reprinted, *Anno* 1653.

By *JOHN BIDLE*, M. A.

And now again with the LIFE of the Author prefixed, *Anno Dom.* 1691.

A SHORT ACCOUNT OF THE LIFE OF John Bidle, M. A.

Sometimes of *Magd. Hall, Oxon.*

THE intelligent and ſearching Reader, finding in this Book, under the Title of *The Apoſtolical and true Opinion, concerning the Holy Trinity, Revived and Aſſerted*, &c. ſeveral Explications of Holy Scripture and Teſtimonies out of the moſt ancient Chriſtian Writers, touching that great and momentous Doctrine, much differing from the commonly-receiv'd Opinions of both Papiſts and Proteſtants of theſe later Ages, will, without doubt, be deſirous to know ſomething of the Author's Life and Qualifications. Let him pleaſe therefore to take this plain and ſhort Account, without thoſe Embelliſhments, which the Lives of eminent Men are deſervedly adorned with, but which my Abilities will not reach to.

Know then, that the Author, *John Bidle*, was born at *Wotton-under-hedg*, in the County of *Glouceſter*, in the Year of our Lord Chriſt, 1615. His Father, *Edward Bidle*, was of a middle ſort of Yeomen, and alſo dealt in Woollen Clothes; by which means he maintained his Family honeſtly, and with credit ſuitable to his Rank, or rather above it. His

Son *John*, our Author, was educated in the Free-School of that Town; where his proficiency in the Learning there taught, was soon taken notice of, both by Neighbours, and those more remote; among whom my Lord *Barkley*, as a Personage of the greatest Honour, so great a lover and promoter of Learning, is in the first place to be remembred. Who in respect to the early Blossoms of a rare Wit, great Probity and Ingenuity in our young Scholar, conferr'd upon him the exhibition of ten Pounds *per Annum*, among other the poorer Scholars; although by his Age, being not of ten Years, he was not qualified, according to common Method, for that Donation. And this Favour, it seems, added greater Vigour and Industry to the Youth's Studies; for after this, he did not only with ease surpass those his School-fellows of the same Rank, but, in Time, even out-run his Instructions, and became Tutor to himself; so overcoming both the Labours of his Task, and those Difficulties he met with in his Course. However, the want of fit Teaching on the one hand, and the benefit of that Exhibition on the other, or perhaps the want of fit Provisions for a Student in the University, detain'd him longer in that School, than was otherwise for his Improvement; for here he continued till he was about Seventeen Years of Age. In this Time he gave some Specimens of his pregnant, both Wit and Judgment, in the Translation of *Virgil's Bucolicks*, and the two first Satyrs of *Juvenal*, into elegant English Verse; afterward publish'd in print, with approbation of Learned Men. He composed also, and recited, before a full Auditory, an elaborate Oration in Latin, for a gracing to the Funeral of an honourable School-fellow. Yea, even in these younger Years was observed in him a singular piety of Mind, and contempt of secular Affairs; Whence it came, that he applied himself to the study of Vertue, together with the Liberal Arts; and with great diligence gave dutiful Assistance to his Mother, become a Widow by the Death of his Father.

From hence he was sent to the University of *Oxford*, and was admitted a Student in *Magdalen-Hall* there; where, in due time, he proceeded Master of Arts with good applause, and was reckon'd among those of his rank, that did in an especial manner commend the Learning of that Academy. Here he did so Philosophize, as it might be observed, he was determined more by Reason than Authority; however, in Divine Things he did not much dissent from the common Doctrine, as may be collected from a little Tract he wrote against Dancing. But the fame of his Learning and Prudence in instructing Pupils there, having conciliated to him the Esteem of Persons of Quality, and more particularly of the Overseers of the School of *Wootton*, he was chosen by them to succeed in the Mastership thereof; which he may seem to have as wisely as modestly refused, but did in the mean time commend to them, another fit Person, whom they accepted of. This refusal gave opportunity to the Magistrates of *Gloucester*, upon ample Recommendations of the principal Persons in the University, to chuse and importune him to be Master of the Free-School of *Crisps* in that City; which he consented to; and at his approach thither, was met and received by them with much Joy and Honour, *Anno* 1641. Neither did he deceive their Expectations, nor come short of the Character had been given of him, whilst he discharged that Imployment with such skil and faithfulness, that they thought themselves not a little happy in that behalf, who could commit their Sons to his Instruction. Whence it came to pass, that not so much by the Salary, which is not great, but by the Gratuities of Parents, he reap'd considerable Profits. But Money did not infect his Mind with the love of it; his Mind was set upon the Knowledg of Divine Truth, and that, not for Curiosity, but for the Love of Christ, who is Truth and Life. And having laid aside the Impediments of Prejudice, he gave himself liberty to try all things, that he might hold fast that which is good. Thus diligently reading the Holy Scripture, (for *Socinian* Books he had read none)

none) and fervently imploring Divine Illumination, he perceiv'd the common Doctrin concerning the Holy Trinity was not well grounded in Revelation, much leſs in Reaſon. And being as generous in ſpeaking, as free in judging, he did, as occaſion offered, diſcover his Reaſons of queſtioning it: Which ſome Zealots not being able to bear, they accus'd him to the Magiſtrates of Hereſy in that Point, before whom he exhibited in Writing this Confeſſion.

May 2, 1644.

1. I believe there is but one Infinite and Almighty Eſſence, called God.

2. I believe, that as there is but one Infinite and Almighty Eſſence, ſo there is but one Perſon in that Eſſence.

3. I believe that our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt is truly God, by being truly, really and properly united to the only Perſon of the Infinite and Almighty Eſſence.

But when this did not ſatisfy the Magiſtrates, but they did ſtill preſs upon him to acknowledg three Perſons in the Divine Eſſence, and he, it ſeems, knowing that the word Perſons, when aſcribed to God, is taken both by the Ancient Fathers, and by Modern Writers in various Significations, did, about fourteen days after, confeſs that that there are three in that one Divine Eſſence commonly termed Perſons.

By this it appears, that how diſtinct ſoever he might be in his Conceptions concerning the Trinity, yet he was not determinate enough in his expreſſing of that matter, as he became not long after. For now proceeding ſincerely in his ſearch of holy Scripture, and in earneſt Prayer to Almighty God for his Aſſiſtance, he attained that firmneſs of Underſtanding and Reſolution, and that diſtinctneſs of Expreſſion, that he ſet himſelf to conſer with his Familiars, and open his Mind freely upon thoſe Queſtions of one God, and three Perſons. And not only ſo, but he alſo wrote ſome pithy Arguments againſt the ſuppoſed Deity of the Holy Spirit, whom yet he held to be the third Perſon in the Holy Trinity. Whereupon a certain unfaithful Perſon betraying him to the Magiſtrate, and the Commiſſioners of Parliament there reſiding, (for then was there War between the King and Parliament) he was committed *Dec.* 2. 1645, to the common Goal (tho at that time afflicted with a ſore Fever) there to be detained till a fit occaſion of preſenting him before the Parliament at *London* (which was then inflamed with *Geneva*-Zeal againſt ſuch Hereticks) to be puniſhed as they ſhould determine. But now an eminent Perſon of *Glouceſter* commiſerating his Caſe, procured his Inlargement upon Security for an Appearance, as aforeſaid, which Mr. *Bidle* made accordingly when ſummoned thereto, about ſix Months after. And the Parliament delayed not to take Cognizance of his Cauſe, for they preſently choſe a Committee to examine him; who freely confeſt before them, that he did deny the commonly believ'd Deity of the Holy Ghoſt, whereof he was accus'd; but was ready to hear what could be oppos'd to him, and to acknowledg his Error, if he could not maintain it for Truth. But being wearied with no leſs long than chargeable Expectation, he wrote the Letter hereafter inſerted, dated *April* 1, 1647, to an eminent Knight, a Member of Parliament, praying he would report his Caſe to their Houſe, that he might be either judged or diſcharged. But what followed thence was the Commitment of Mr. *Bidle* to the Cuſtody of one of their Officers (which Reſtraint continued for five Years enſuing) and the referring him to the Aſſembly of the Presbyterian Divines, then ſitting at *Weſtminſter*, for his Conviction: Before ſome of which he often appear'd, and gave them in Writing his Arguments againſt the Deity of the Holy Spirit; but neither in Diſcourſes nor in Writing could he obtain any pertinent, much leſs ſolid Anſwer. Inſtead of that, they ſolicite the Parliament, in whoſe hands was the ſupream Power at that time, and procure a Draconick Ordinance (*May* 2. 1648.) for inflicting the Puniſhment of Death upon thoſe that held Opinions contrary to the Presbyterian Points about the

Trinity

Trinity, and other Doctrines, whom they named Blaſphemers and Hereticks, and ſevere Penalties upon thoſe that differ'd in leſſer matters. This ſeemed a Damnatory Sentence againſt Mr. *Bidle*, which there was no eſcape from. But it pleaſed the Almighty to make way for him, by a Diſſention in the Parliament it ſelf; to the better part whereof the Army joyn'd its Power, as for other Reaſons, ſo for that there were in it many both Officers and Soulders, liable to the Severities of that mention'd Ordinance, which therefore from that time for divers Years lay unregarded.

Before this he had publiſhed the *Twelve Arguments againſt the Deity of the Holy Spirit*, and this Year his Confeſſion of Faith touching the Holy Trinity, which were both Reprinted, *Anno* 1653. together with moſt clear and full Teſtimonies for the Unity of the Perſon of God in diſtinction from the Son and Spirit, out of certain moſt celebrated Chriſtian Fathers, who lived in the firſt Ages after Chriſt, and others. Now the Zealots in Parliament againſt Diſſenters being excluded, he had more liberty allow'd by his Keeper, who ſuffered him upon Security given to go into *Staffordſhire*, where he lived ſometimes with a Juſtice of Peace, who not only entertained him courteouſly, but at his Death left him a Legacy, which was a very ſeaſonable ſupply to him who had already ſpent in a manner all he had gotten at *Glouceſter*, or elſewhere (which was not inconſiderable) in now about four Years chargeable reſtraint. But he could not continue long here, before notice was given to Judg *Bradſhaw*, Preſident of the Council of State, who caus'd him to be recal'ed by his Keeper, and kept more ſtraitly. In this long Confinement, that which was moſt grievous to this Sufferer (devoted to the Service of Truth) was, that the Imputation of Blaſphemy and Hereſy to him, had ſo alienated all People generally from him, that he could have almoſt none to converſe with; and of the Divines, whoſe Duty it was to have endeavoured his Information, not one (that I could ever here of) vouchſafed him a Viſit in that ſeven Years time of his Confinement, except perhaps one Mr. *Gunning*, afterward Biſhop of *Ely*. Here he ſpent even all his Subſtance, inſomuch that inſtead of an Ordinary for repaſt which he could not pay for, he was glad of the cheaper ſupport of drinking a draught of Milk from the Cow Morning and Evening. At length it pleaſed the Divine Goodneſs to ſuccour him through the favour of a Learned Man, who commended him to *Roger Daniel* the Printer, for a Man qualified with fit Learning and Integrity for correcting of the Impreſſion of the Septuagint Greek Bible, which was then deſigned to be ſet forth with great Accuracy, and was accordingly performed the Imployment being alſo moſt acceptable to *J. Bidle*, becauſe his delight was in the Law of God.

But in *Feb.* 1651, was promulgated by the Parliament a general Act of Oblivion, which reſtored among others our conſcientious Priſoner to his full Liberty, which he now improves among thoſe Friends he had at length gained in *London*, in meeting together every Lord's-day for expounding Scripture, and diſcourſing thereupon, for the clearing of the Truths therein contained, and detecting of common Errors; by which means the Doctrine of one God, and Chriſt his only Son, and his Holy Spirit, was ſo propagated, that the Miniſters at *London* were exceedingly offended at it, but could not hinder it by Secular Power, which then favour'd Liberty of Religion and Conſcience. In the Year 1654, he publiſh'd a twofold Scripture-Catechiſm. In the ſame Year Dr. *Gunning* (whom I named before) afterward *Regius Profeſſor* of Divinity at *Cambridg*, and no leſs famous for Subtilty of diſputing than Learning, thinking (it ſeems) he ſhould do great Service to the common Doctrine, if he put a Baffle upon the great Oppugner of it, before even thoſe who began to hearken to him; he came one Lord's-day to Mr. *Bidle*'s Meeting, well accompanied with learned Witneſſes, and commences a fair Scholaſtick Diſpute aſſerting the Deity of the Holy Ghoſt; and the next Lord's-day in the ſame Auditory concerning the ſupream Deity of Chriſt, the Son of the moſt High. They diſputed ſyllogiſtically, and

and took their turns of reſponding and oppoſing, wherein *John Bidle* acquitted himſelf with ſo much Learning, Judgment and Knowledg in the ſenſe of Holy Scriptures, that inſtead of loſing, he gained much Credit both to himſelf and his Cauſe, as even the Gentlemen of Dr. *Gunning*'s Party, ſome of them had the ingenuity to acknowledg. After this Dr. *Gunning* comes again at unawares, and hears *J. Biddle* arguing againſt the Satisfaction of Punitive Juſtice by the Death of Chriſt, which the Doctor with great vigour defends; but found the Opponent no leſs skilful and dextrous in this conflict than in the former, which the Doctor himſelf had the Generoſity afterward to confeſs.

In *December* following he was brought to the Bar of the Commons Houſe of Parliament, conveen'd by *Oliver Cromwel* the Protector, and there asked, If he was the Author of that *Two-fold Scripture Catechiſm*, (wherein all the Queſtions are anſwered in the words of Scripture at large)? He anſwered by asking, Whether it ſeem'd reaſonable, that one brought before a Judgment-Seat as a Criminal, ſhould accuſe himſelf? And they preſently committed him a cloſe Priſoner to the *Gatehouſe*, *Decemb.* 3. prohibiting him the uſe of Pen, Ink, and Paper, or the acceſs of any Viſitant; and commanded his Books to be burnt by the common Executioner. In this caſe nothing leſs than capital Puniſhment could be expected; which, notwithſtanding, the Priſoner bare a compoſed and chearful Mind, hoping in God, whoſe Cauſe he ſuffer'd for, for a happy Event. Neither did this Hope deceive him, for the Protector, for Reaſons of his own Intereſt, diſſolv'd that Parliament: and the Priſoner, after about ſix Months Impriſonment, obtain'd his Liberty at the Court of the *Kings*, or *Upper Bench*, *May* 28. by due Courſe of Law; Neither was he any whit diſcouraged by theſe Dangers and Sufferings, but betook himſelf to his former Exerciſes for propagating Truth, and the Honour of Almighty God concern'd therein.

But ſcarce a Year was expired, when another no leſs formidable Danger overtook him, which was thus: There was a conſiderable number of a Congregation of thoſe called *Anabaptiſts*, who began to entertain *J. Bidle*'s Sentiments concerning the Trinity. The Paſtor, one *Griffin*, thinking (it ſhould ſeem) to reduce them to their former Opinion, and to put a ſtop to the ſpreading of this Gangreen, (as he eſteemed it) challenges Mr. *Bidle* to a publick Diſputation, at his Meeting place at St. *Paul*'s, upon the Subject of Chriſt's Supream Deity; which he would have declin'd, as knowing Mr. *Griffin* to be far inferior to him in Learning, &c. but at length he accepted it: And being met in the midſt of a numerous Auditory, among whom not a few of *J. Bidle*'s inveterate and fiery Adverſaries, eſpecially ſome Bookſellers: Mr. *Griffin*, either imprudently, or to prejudice the Hearers againſt his Antagoniſt, or for ſome worſe End, repeating the Queſtion, asks, If any Man there did deny, that Chriſt was God moſt High? To which our *Bidle* reſolutely and conſcientiouſly anſwers, *I do deny it*: By which generous Profeſſion, he gave his Adverſaries occaſion of a poſitive and clear Accuſation, which they ſoon laid hold of. For though *John Griffin* was not (in the Judgment of all Judicious Hearers) able to cope with *John Bidle*, yet he had the confidence to conſent to another Meeting, when *J. Bidle* ſhould take his turn of proving the Negative of the Queſtion between them. But before that Day came, he was caſt into the Priſon, firſt of the *Compter*, then of *Newgate*, *London*, July 3. 1655. and tried for his Life the next Seſſions, upon that obſolete and abrogated Ordinance, againſt Blaſphemy and Hereſy, of *May* 2. 1648. mention'd before. To the Indictment hereupon, he prays Counſel might be allow'd him to plead the illegality of it; Which being denied him by the Judges, and the Sentence of a Mute threatned, he at length gave into Court his Exceptions ingroſſed in Parchment; and with much ſtrugling, had Counſel allow'd him; but the Trial was deferr'd to the next Day. But the Protector well knowing it was not for the Intereſt of his Government, either to have

have him Condemn'd or Abſolv'd, takes him out of the Hands of the Law, and ſends him away to the Iſle of *Scilly*, *Octob.* 5. 1655. For, on the one Hand, the Presbyterians, and all Enemies to Liberty of Religion, (of which there appear'd a great number at his Trial) would be offended at his Releaſe; and all that were for Liberty, (among whom many Congregations of *Anabaptiſts* eſpecially) had petition'd the Protector for his diſcharge from proſecution upon that Ordinance, by which all their Liberties were threatned and condemned, and the Capital Article of the Protector's Government infringed; which run thus, *That ſuch as profeſs Faith in God by Jeſus Chriſt, (though differing in Judgment from the Doctrine, Worſhip, or Diſcipline publickly held forth) ſhall not be reſtrained from, but ſhall be protected*, &c. Art. 37. *That all Laws, Statutes, Ordinances*, &c. *to the contrary of the aforeſaid Liberty, ſhall be eſteemed as Null and Void*, Art. 38.

Now although this Baniſhment drew with it many Inconveniences, yet through the Goodneſs of God it was temper'd with Mercies. Here the Priſoner enjoy'd much Divine Comfort from the Heavenly Contemplations, which his Retirement gave him opportunity for: Here he had ſweet Communion with the Father, and his Son Jeſus Chriſt, and attained a clearer Underſtanding of the Divine Oracles in many particulars. Here, whilſt he was more abundantly confirm'd in the Doctrines of his Confeſſion of Faith, *&c.* yet he ſeems notwithſtanding to have become more doubtful about ſome other Points, which he had formerly held, as appears from his *Eſſay to the Explaining of the Revelation*, which he wrote after his return thence: which ſhews that he ſtill maintain'd a free and unprejudiced Mind. And here we muſt not forget to do the Protector this right, as to tell the World, that after ſome time he was pleaſed to allow his Priſoner a Hundred Crowns *per Annum* for his ſubſiſtance, to wit, leſt being removed far from his Friends and Imployments, he ſhould want Neceſſaries. This Baniſhment ſeems alſo to have been beneficial to him on this Account, that it was a means to prevent another of the Protector's Parliaments from decreeing any thing more rigid againſt him, being now abſent and out of their way. In this Exile he continued about three Years, notwithſtanding all Endeavours of his Friends for his Liberty; and his own Letters, both to the Protector and to Mr. *Calamy*, (an eminent Presbyterian Miniſter) to reaſon them into compaſſion. At length, through the Importunity of Friends, and other Occurrences, the Protector ſuffer'd a Writ of *Habeas Corpus* to be granted out of the *Upper-Bench Court* (as it was then called) and to be obeyed by the Governour of *Scilly*, whereby the Priſoner was brought thence, and by that Court ſet at liberty, as finding no legal Cauſe of detaining him.

And now, notwithſtanding all theſe Perſecutions, Sufferings and Dangers he had hitherto underwent, he was not terrified, from what he counted his Duty to Chriſt, in propagating the true knowledg of the only true God, and of Jeſus Chriſt whom he had ſent, but return'd to his long interrupted Exerciſes among his Friends. But he could not long labour in this Field, for about five Months after, the Protector *Oliver* dies, and his Son *Richard* ſucceeding, calls a Parliament, dangerous certainly to *John Bidle* in the firſt place, if to any other; which being foreſeen, he was forced as it were, (for he did it with regret,) by the Importunity of a Noble Friend, to retire into the Country during their Seſſion. But that Parliament being diſſolv'd, he returned to his wonted Station, till ſuch time as the Diviſions between the Protector and Army had brought into Power again the Long Parliament; and the Diviſions of that Parliament, and Army, and People, had brought in General *Monk* out of *Scotland*, he the Secluded Members, and they the Exil'd King *Charles*, and with him a reſtoration of the Antient Government in Church and State. Then after ſome time the Liberty of Diſſenting Worſhippers was taken away, and their Meetings puniſh'd as ſeditious. Now *J. Bidle* yields to the Time, and reſtrains himſelf

ſelf from publick to more private Aſſemblies. But neither could he long enjoy thoſe, however peaceable and harmleſs, for on the firſt of *June*, 1662. He was haled out of his Lodgings, where he was conven'd with ſome few of his Friends for Divine Worſhip, and carried before Sir *Rich. Brown*, who forthwith committed them all to the publick Priſon; *J. Bidle* to the Dungeon, where he lay for five hours, and was denied the benefit of the Law, which admits Offenders of that ſort to Bail for their Appearance. There they lay till the Recorder, moved with more reverence of the Laws, took ſecurity for their anſwering to their Charge next Seſſions; which they perform'd accordingly. But when the Court could not find any Statute whereon to form any Criminal Indictment againſt them, they were referr'd to the Seſſions following; and then were proceeded againſt, by pretext of an Offence againſt Common Law, (the Rules of which lie moſtly in the Judges Breaſts) and thereupon fined every one of the Hearers in the penalty of Twenty Pounds, and *J. Bidle* in One Hundred; to lie in Priſon till paid. Now though the Sheriff would generouſly have been ſatisfied with Ten Pounds for him, and he would have paid it, yet the Enmity of Sir *Rich. Brown* was ſuch, as he could not be induced to conſent thereto upon any terms; but threatn'd him with a Seven Years Impriſonment, though he ſhould pay the whole Hundred Pounds; This was the cauſe of his continuing in Priſon; but he had not been there full five Weeks, till by reaſon of the noiſomneſs of the Place and pent Air, to him, whoſe only Recreation and Exerciſe had been, for many Years, to walk daily into the free Air, he contracted a Diſeaſe, which in a few days, alas, put a period to his Life. In this Extremity Sir *R. Brown* could not be moved to grant the Sick Priſoner the preſent Comfort of a Removal, in order to a Recovery; but Sheriff *Meynel*, to the praiſe of his great Humanity, did grant it: But, alas, the ſecond Day after his removal, between five and ſix a Clock in the Morning, the 22*th* of *September* 1662. he quietly gave up his Spirit to God. He was then in the ſtrength of his Age, the 47*th* Year of his Life. Now it did appear, (as he had ſaid formerly) that by frequent Meditations of the Reſurrection and future Happineſs, he had made Death contemptible to himſelf. For as ſoon, as by the Diſeaſe more ſtrongly annoying his Brain, he perceiv'd a great Alteration, he ſignified it to his Friends, and would not be induced to any Diſcourſe, but compos'd himſelf as it were to ſleep, during that eight hours time, which after that he liv'd, being very ſparing of Words, or indeed of Groans, that might argue any Impatience; notwithſtanding, when a certain pious Matron, who miniſtred to him, broke forth into this (as it were) Farewel-ſaying, *God grant we may ſee one another in the Kingdom of Heaven*: He, now his Speech failing, left up his quivering Hand, ſhewing thereby (it ſeems) how pleaſing that Wiſh was to him. And that he was not ſurpriz'd with dying at this time, may be collected from his often ſaying before, That if he ſhould be once more caſt into Priſon, he ſhould never be reſtor'd to Liberty; and moreover, *That the Work was done*, meaning, That that Truth which God had rais'd him up to profeſs, was ſufficiently brought to light, there wanted only Ingenuity in Men, for the embracing and acknowledging it.

Having in this manner deſcribed the Courſe of *John Bidle*'s Life, it may perhaps be enquired, why being ſo learned and able a Man, he publiſhed ſo few Books, eſpecially being provoked by divers Anſwers to what he did publiſh, to which he did not reply? To this it may be anſwered, firſt, That he was verily perſwaded, that Truth being in it ſelf plain and ſimple, eſpecially what is neceſſary and very uſeful, is eaſy to be apprehended by few words; it's Error that ſeeks Garniſh in many Words and Figures of Speech. Again, what he did publiſh, he well deliberated of; ſo that he did not find in the adverſe Writings, any thing of moment, which an attentive Reader might not perceive already obviated: And they that attend not to the firſt

Propoſitions, will not receive benefit by Replies and Rejoinders. We add, that he treading in a Path, long over-grown with Briars and Thorns of Error and Sophiſtry, it requir'd vaſtly greater Labour and Diligence to find out the Way of Truth, in which no Engliſh-Man had by any appearing Foot-ſteeps gone before him for many Ages.

But that which in my Judgment does more commend our *John Bidle*, than all his Labours and Sufferings for the propagation of great and important Truths, is his great Zeal for promoting Holineſs of Life and Manners; for this was always his End and Deſign in what he taught. He valued not his Doctrines for Speculation but Practice; inſomuch that he would not diſcourſe of thoſe Points wherein he differed from others, with thoſe that appear'd not religious according to their Knowledg. Neither could he bear thoſe that diſſembled in Profeſſion for Worldly Intereſts. He was a ſtrict Obſerver himſelf, and a ſevere Exactor in others, of reverence in ſpeaking of God, and Chriſt, and Holy Things; ſo that he would by no means hear their Names, or any Sentence of Holy Scripture us'd vainly or lightly, much leſs any fooliſh Talking, or Scurrility. He would often tell his Friends, that no Religion would benefit a bad Man; and call upon them to reſolve with themſelves, as well to profeſs and practiſe the Truth that is according to Godlineſs, as to ſtudy to find it out; and that againſt all Terrors or Allurements to the contrary; being aſſured that nothing diſpleaſing to Almighty God, could be in any wiſe profitable to them. But as for thoſe that were really of a contrary Mind to him, how mean ſoever, (for he was very humble and condeſcending) they could not oblige him more, than by pertinent Objections, ſoberly urg'd, to give him the opportunity of reſolving them; which he always did with great ſimplicity and plainneſs of Speech, without any oſtentation of Learning, which yet he was as much maſter of, as thoſe moſt famous on that Account. Indeed his Learning in Matters of Religion was gain'd by a diligent ſtudy of the Holy Scriptures, eſpecially of the New Teſtament, wherein he was ſo converſant, that he retain'd it all in his Memory *verbatim*, not only in Engliſh, but in Greek, as far as the Fourth Chapter of *the Revelation of St. John*. This thorow-knowledg in the Scriptures, join'd with an ordinary, happy, and ready Memory, whereby he retain'd alſo the Sum of what he had read in other Authors, gave him great advantage againſt all Opponents, and in all Diſcourſes, but without the leaſt appearance of boaſting.

I could mention many other things, which ſhew that it was in his Heart to promote Piety, and that he had no deſign of aggrandizing his Name by oppoſition to common Doctrins. Indeed, he was a great Aſſerter of common Doctrines againſt Noval Opinions, that tended either to Sedition, Libertiniſm, or Superſtition. And in what he held contrary to the Current, he did not endeavour to tie thoſe he had won, to be of his Mind in ſuch a Society, and by ſuch a Society, and by ſuch bands, as might continue them a ſucceſſive Party, bearing his Name as their Founder, but left them at all that liberty, which the Duty of owning the Truth according to their Conſcience, and of mutual edification, would allow them. And as no tincture of Ambition did appear in him, ſo neither of the leaſt degree of coveting worldly Gain: for he always ſuſtain'd himſelf by his own Induſtry, when he was in capacity of uſing it; and would never accept of any Supplies, tho offer'd; but when his Neceſſities, ariſing from Impriſonment, Sickneſs, or the like, forc'd him to it, (Except that after his ſeven Years reſtraint, a friendly Citizen of *London* importun'd him to take a Bed and Board with him; and after his Deliverance from *Scilly* another did the like) for he had learn'd to be contented with a little, and ſought not more, yea out of that little would contribute to the Neceſſities of others. Temperance was at all times moſt conſpicuous in him, as well in eating as in drinking: and he thought it not enough to be very chaſt, but that he

ought

ought to avoid all ſuſpicion of unchaſtity; inſomuch that he would not willingly look upon a Woman without juſt occaſion; and was very uneaſy, if left in a room with one alone, till reliev'd by more Company.

I have ſpoken above of the Reverence and Gravity he us'd himſelf, and exacted of others, in handling of Holy Things; in other matters he would be merry and pleaſant, and liked well that the Company ſhould be ſo too; yet even in this common Converſe, he always retain'd an awe of the Divine Preſence, and was ſometimes obſerv'd to lift up his Hand ſuddenly; which thoſe that were intimate with him, knew to be an effect of a ſecret Ejaculation. But in his Cloſet-Devotions, he was wont often to proſtrate himſelf upon the Ground, after the manner of our Saviour in his Agony, and would commend that Poſture of Worſhip alſo to his moſt intimate Friends. But his Devotion toward God, and ſtudy for propagating Divine Truth, did not, as in ſome Perſons, ſwallow up his Juſtice and Charity toward Men, for he was as careful a practiſer and promoter of thoſe Virtues, as his Opinion of their Neceſſity to Salvation did require.

In fine, many more things might be remembred, which might demonſtrate *John Bidle*, to have been a Man, if any in this laſt Age, moſt eminent for Piety and Virtue, as well as Learning and Knowledg. But thus much at leaſt was due to his Memory, not only to vindicate him from thoſe Depraved Affections that encline Men to Hereſy, and to be the Authors of new Sects: but to give the World an Example of a ſincere Reformer.

THE END.

A Letter written to Sir H. V. *a Member of the Honourable Houſe of Commons.*

SIR,

HAving now attended for the ſpace of ſixteen Months, partly in the Country, and partly in *Weſtminſter*, that I might come to my Anſwer before the Parliament; and finding, after all this tarriance, that I am ſtill as far from having my Cauſe determined as ever: I am even forced to make my Addreſs to you, and to beſeech you, if you have any Bowels towards them that are in Miſery, that you would either procure my Diſcharge, or at leaſt make Report to the Houſe touching my denial of the ſuppoſed Deity of the Holy Spirit. For that this only is the Matter in Conteſtation, you very well know, having both heard my Confeſſion before the Committee, and remembring how, when I was urged to declare my Judgment concerning the Deity of Chriſt, I waved the Queſtion, as neither being that I was accuſed of, nor which I had yet ſufficiently ſtudied, to engage my ſelf publickly therein. As for my Opinion touching the Holy Spirit, it is thus: *I believe the Holy Spirit to be the chief of all* * *miniſtring Spirits, peculiarly ſent out from Heaven to miniſter on their behalf that ſhall inherit Salvation: and I do place him, both according to the Scripture, and the Primitive Chriſtians, and by Name* Juſtin Martyr *in his Apology, in the third Rank after God and Chriſt, giving him a pre-eminence above all the reſt of the Heavenly Hoſt: So that as there is one principal Spirit among the Evil Angels, known in Scripture by the Name of* Satan, *or the* (*a*) Adverſary; *or* (*b*) the unclean Spirit; *or* (*c*) the evil Spirit of God; *or* (*d*) the Spirit *of God*; *or* (*e*) the Spirit *by way of Eminence: Even ſo is there one principal Spirit,* (I borrow this Appellation from the *Septuagint*, who render the latter Clauſe of the 12*th* Verſ. of *Pſal.* 51. in this manner, πνεῦμα ἡγεμονικὸν στήριξόν με, *Spiritu principali fulci me*, Stabliſh me with thy principal Spirit) *there is, I ſay, one principal Spirit among the Good Angels, called by the Name of the*

* See *Heb.* 1. 1, 14. whence theſe words are borrowed; and compare it with 1 *Pet.* 1. 12. as alſo *Heb.* 1. 7. compared with *Act.* 2. 2, 3, 4. and it will eaſily appear that the Holy Spirit is a Miniſter of God, as well as others.

(*a*) 1 Pet. 5. 8. (*b*) Zech. 13. 2. (*c*) 1 Sam. 16. 15, 16. (*d*) *Ibid.* verſ. *ult.* (*e*) 1 King. 22. 21. See the Original.

the (*a*) Advocate; *or* (*b*) the Holy Spirit; *or* (*c*) the good Spirit of God; *or* (*d*) the Spirit of God; *or* (*e*) the Spirit, *by way of eminence*. This Opinion of mine is atteſted by the whole Tenour of the Scripture, which perpetually ſpeaketh of him as differing from God, and inferior to him; but is irrefragably proved by theſe places of Scripture, *Neh.* 9. 6, 20. *Thou, even thou art Lord* (*or Jehovah*) *alone; thou haſt made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens, with all their Hoſt. Thou gaveſt thy good Spirit to inſtruct them* (*the Children of* Iſrael.)] John 16. 7, 8, &c. *Nevertheleſs, I tell you the Truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the* * *Advocate will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will ſend him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove* (in the Original, *convince*) *the World of Sin, and of Righteouſneſs, and of Judgment. I have yet many things to ſay unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will guide you into all Truth; for he ſhall not ſpeak of himſelf; but whatſoever he ſhall hear, that ſhall he ſpeak; and he ſhall ſhew you things to come. He ſhall glorify me; for he ſhall receive of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you. All things that the Father hath, are mine: therefore ſaid I, he ſhall take of mine, and ſhew it unto you.*] Rom. 8. 26, 27. *Likewiſe the Spirit alſo helpeth our Infirmities; for we know not what we ſhould pray for as we ought: but the Spirit himſelf maketh interceſſion for us, with Groans that cannot be uttered. But he that ſearcheth the Hearts, knoweth what is the Mind* (*or Deſire*) *of the Spirit: for he maketh interceſſion for the Saints according to the Will of God.*] Acts 19. 2. *And* (*Paul*) *finding certain Diſciples, ſaid unto them, Have ye received the Holy Spirit ſince ye believed? And they ſaid unto him, We have not ſo much as heard whether there be any Holy Spirit.*] Epheſ. 4. 4, 5, 6. *There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye have been called in one Hope of your Calling. One Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm. One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.*] 1 Cor. 12. 3, 4, &c. *Wherefore I give you to underſtand, that no Man ſpeaking by the Spirit of God, calleth Jeſus accurſed; and that no Man can ſay that Jeſus is the Lord, but by the Holy Spirit; but there are diverſities of Gifts, yet the ſame Spirit. And there are diverſities of Adminiſtrations, yet the ſame Lord; and there are diverſities of Operations, yet it is the ſame God that worketh all in all.*] Luk. 3. 21, 22. *It came to paſs that Jeſus al-*

(*a*) Joh. 16. 7. (*b*) Epheſ. 4. 30. (*c*) Neh. 9. 20. (*d*) 1 Cor. 7. 40. (*e*) Act. 10. 19.

* So the word παράκλητος in the Original perpetually ſignifieth amongſt Greek Authors, and is ſo rendred by the Tranſlators themſelves, 1 *Joh.* 2. 1. and ought to have been ſo rendred here, eſpecially becauſe he ſaith in the following words, that the Holy Spirit ſhall convince the World; for it is proper to an Advocate to convince.

ſo being baptized, and praying, the Heaven was opened, and the Holy Spirit deſcended in a bodily ſhape like a Dove upon him.] 1 Cor. 2. 11, 12, 13. *But God hath revealed them to us by his Spirit; for the Spirit ſearcheth all things, even the Depths of God. For what Man knoweth the things of a Man, ſave the Spirit of a Man, which is in him? even ſo the things of God knoweth none, but the Spirit of God,* (he doth not add, as before, *which is in him.*) *Now we have received, not the Spirit of the World, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given us of God.*] Rev. 22. 12, 17. *Behold, I come quickly, and my Reward is with me, to give unto every Man according as his Work ſhall be: and the Spirit and the Bride ſay, Come.*] Act. 5. 32. *And we are his Witneſſes of theſe things, and ſo is alſo the Holy Spirit, whom God hath given to them that obey him.*] Gal. 3. 5. *He therefore that miniſtreth (or giveth) to you the Spirit, and worketh Miracles among you, doth he it by the Works of the Law, or by the Hearing (or rather, Preaching) of Faith?*] *He that miniſtreth, or giveth the Spirit to you*; a ſtrange kind of Speech, if the Holy Ghoſt were God. The Scripture is wont to ſpeak more ſoberly of Almighty God, than to ſay that he is given by another, much leſs by Men, as it is here ſaid of the Holy Spirit, 1 *Cor.* 8. 4. *We know that an Idol is nothing in the World, and that there is no other God but one. For though there be that are called Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth; as there be many Gods, and many Lords, yet unto us there is but one God, even the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord, even Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we by him.*] You ſee here, that the Apoſtle being about to ſet down, who is the only God, and only Lord of Chriſtians, maketh no mention of the Holy Spirit; which could not have been done by ſo faithful an Apoſtle, had the Holy Spirit been either God or Lord. Of theſe Places thus recited, no Man, tho never ſo ſubtile, and tho he turn and wind his Wit every way, ſhall ever be able to make Senſe, unleſs he take the Holy Spirit to be what I ſay.

Behold now the Cauſe for which I have lien under Perſecution, raiſed againſt me by my Adverſaries; who being unable to juſtify by Argument their Practice of giving Glory to the Holy Spirit, as God, in the end of their Prayers, ſince there is neither Precept nor Example for it in all the Scripture; and being taxed by me for giving the Glory of God to another, and worſhipping what he hath not commanded, nor ever came into his Heart, have, in a cruel and unchriſtian manner, reſorted to the Arm of Fleſh, and inſtigated the Magiſtrate againſt me, hoping by his Sword, (not that of the Spirit) to uphold their Will-worſhip; but in vain, ſince every Plant that the Heavenly Father hath not ſet, ſhall be rooted up. And that this practice of Worſhipping the Holy Spirit as God, is ſuch a Plant as God never ſet in his Word, would

ſoon

ſoon appear to the Honourable Houſe, could they be but ſo far prevailed with, as, laying aſide all Prejudice, ſeriouſly to weigh the many and ſolid Proofs that I produce for my Opinion out of the Scripture, together with the ſlight, or rather no Proofs of the adverſe Party for their Opinion; which they themſelves know not what to make of, but that they endeavour to delude both themſelves and others with Perſonalities, Moods, Subſiſtences, and ſuch like brain-ſick Notions, that have neither ſap nor ſence in them, and were firſt hatched by the ſubtility of Satan in the Heads of Platoniſts, to pervert the Worſhip of the True God. Neither could this Controverſy be ſet on foot in a fitter juncture of time than this; wherein the Parliament and Kingdom have ſolemnly engaged themſelves to reform Religion, both in Diſcipline and Doctrine. For amongſt all the Corruptions in Doctrine, which certainly are many, there is none that more deſerveth to be amended than this, that ſo palpably thwarteth the whole tenour of the Scripture, and trencheth to the very Object of our Worſhip, and therefore ought not to be lightly paſſed over by any Man that profeſſeth himſelf a Chriſtian, much more a Reformer. God is jealous of his Honour, and will not give it to another; we therefore, as beloved Children, ſhould imitate our Heavenly Father herein, and not upon any pretence whatſoever depart from his expreſs Command, and give the Worſhip of the ſupreme Lord of Heaven and Earth, to him whom the Scripture no-where affirmeth to be God. For my own particular, after a long impartial inquiry of the Truth, in this Controverſy, and after much and earneſt calling upon God, to give unto me the Spirit of Wiſdom and Revelation in the knowledg of him; I find my ſelf obliged, both by the Principles of Scripture and of Reaſon, to embrace the Opinion I now hold forth; and as much as in me lieth, to endeavour that the Honour of Almighty God be not transferred to another, not only to the Offence of God himſelf, but alſo of his Holy Spirit, who cannot but be grieved to have that ignorantly aſcribed to himſelf, which is proper to God that ſends him, and which he no-where challengeth to himſelf in the Scripture. What ſhall befal me in the purſuance of this Work, I refer to the diſpoſal of the all-wiſe God, whoſe Glory is dearer to me, not only than my Liberty, but than my Life. It will be your part, Honoured Sir, into whoſe hands God hath put ſuch an Opportunity, to examine the Buſineſs impartially, and to be an helper to the Truth, conſidering that this Controverſy is of the greateſt importance in the World, and that the Divine Truth ſuffers her ſelf not to be deſpiſed Scot-free. Neither let the meanneſs of my outward preſence deter you from ſtirring, ſince it is the part of a wiſe Man, as in all things, ſo eſpecially in Matters of Religion, not to regard ſo much who it is that ſpeaketh, as what it is that is ſpoken; remembring how our Saviour in the Goſpel ſaith, That God

is

is wont to hide his Secrets from the Wise and Prudent, and to reveal them unto Children. In which number I willingly reckon my self, being conscious of mine own personal Weakness, but well assured of the Strength and Evidence of the Scripture to bear me out in this Cause; and remain

April 1. 1647. Yours in the Lord,

J. Bidle.

To the READER.

CHristian Reader, I beseech thee, as thou tenderest thy Salvation, that thou wouldst throughly examine the following Disputation, in the Fear of God, considering how much his Glory is concerned therein; and at any hand forbear to condemn my Opinion as erroneous, till thou art able to bring pertinent and solid Answers to all my Arguments; for thou must know, that tho I have contested with sundry Learned Men, yet hath none hitherto produced a satisfactory Answer to so much as one Argument. Farewel.

J. B.

ERRATA.

XII. *Arg.* Pag. 13. Col. 1. line 2. read *is not here.*
Test. Page 7. *Just. Mart.* Col. 2. line 16. read αἰνοῦντες.
Cons. P. 9. Col. 1. l. 6. r. *ver.* 27. P. 16. Col. 1. l. 15. for *the*, r. *his.*

XII

XII ARGUMENTS drawn out of the Scripture:

Wherein the commonly received Opinion touching the Deity of the Holy Spirit, is clearly and fully refuted.

Argument I.

HE that is diſtinguiſhed from God, is not God. The Holy Spirit is diſtinguiſhed from God. *Ergo.*

The *Major* is evident: for if he ſhould be both God, and diſtinguiſhed from God, he would be diſtinguiſhed from himſelf; which implies a Contradiction. The *Minor* is confirmed by the whole current of the Scripture, which calleth him *the Spirit of God*, and ſaith that *he is ſent by God, and ſearcheth the depths of God*, &c. Neither let any Man here think to fly to that ignorant Refuge of making a diſtinction between the Eſſence and Perſon of God, ſaying that the Holy Spirit is diſtinguiſhed from God, taken Perſonally, not Eſſentially: For this wretched diſtinction (to omit the mention of the Primitive Fathers) is not only unheard of in Scripture, and ſo to be rejected, it being Preſumption to affirm any thing of the unſearchable Nature of God, which he hath not firſt affirmed of himſelf in the Scripture; but is alſo diſclaimed by Reaſon. For firſt, it is impoſſible for any Man, if he would but endeavour to conceive the thing, and not delude both himſelf and others with empty Terms, and Words without underſtanding, to diſtinguiſh the Perſon from the Eſſence of God, and not to frame two Beings or Things in his Mind, and conſequently two Gods. Secondly, If the Perſon be diſtinct from the Eſſence of God, then it muſt needs be *ſomething*; ſince *nothing* hath no Accident, and therefore neither can it happen to it to be diſtinguiſhed. If ſomething, then either ſome finite or infinite thing: if finite, then there will be ſomething finite in God, and conſequently, ſince by the Confeſſion of the Adverſaries every thing in God is God himſelf, God will be Finite; which the Adverſaries themſelves will likewiſe confeſs to be abſurd. If Infinite, then there will be two Infinites in God, to wit, the Perſon and Eſſence of God, and conſequently two Gods; which is more abſurd than the former. Thirdly, To talk of God taken impersonally, is ridiculous, not only becauſe there is no Example thereof in Scripture, but becauſe God is the Name of a * Perſon, and ſignifieth him that hath ſublime Dominion or Power; and when it is put for the moſt High God, it denoteth him who with Soveraign and Abſolute Authority ruleth over all; but none but a Perſon can rule over others, all Actions being proper to Perſons; wherefore to take God otherwiſe than perſonally,

* *By Perſon, I underſtand, as Philoſophers do,* Suppoſitum intelligens, *that is an intellectual Subſtance compleat, and not a Mood or Subſtente, which are fantaſtical and ſenſeleſs Terms, brought in to cozen the ſimple.*

ſonally, is to take him otherwiſe than he is, and indeed to miſtake him.

Argument II.

IF he that gave the Holy Spirit to the *Iſraelites* to inſtruct them, be Jehovah alone, then the Holy Spirit is not Jehovah or God. But he that gave the Holy Spirit to the *Iſraelites* to inſtruct them, is Jehovah alone. *Ergo.*

The Sequel of the *Major* is plain; for if he that gave the Holy Spirit be Jehovah alone, and yet the Holy Spirit that was given be Jehovah too, the ſame will be Jehovah alone, and not Jehovah alone, which implies a Contradiction. The *Minor* is evident by *Neh.* 9. 6, 20.

Argument III.

HE that ſpeaketh not of himſelf, is not God. The Holy Spirit ſpeaketh not of himſelf. *Ergo.*

The *Minor* is clear from *Joh.* 16. 13. The *Major* is proved thus: God ſpeaketh of himſelf; therefore if there be any one that ſpeaketh not of himſelf, he is not God. The Antecedent is of it ſelf apparent; for God is the primary Author of whatſoever he doth; but ſhould he not ſpeak of himſelf, he muſt ſpeak from another, and ſo not be the primary, but ſecondary Author of his Speech; which is abſurd, if at leaſt that may be called abſurd, which is impoſſible. The Conſequence is undeniable. For further Confirmation of this Argument, it is to be obſerved, that to ſpeak or to do any thing not of himſelf, according to the ordinary Phraſe of the Scripture, is to ſpeak or do by the ſhewing, teaching, commanding, authorizing, or enabling of another, and conſequently incompatible with the ſupream and ſelf-ſufficient Majeſty of God. *Vid. Joh.* 5. 19, 20, 30. *Joh.* 7. 15, 16, 17, 18, 28. *Joh.* 8. 28, 42. *Joh.* 11. 50, 51. *John* 12. 49, 50. *John* 14. 10, 24. *John* 15. 4. *John* 18. 34. *Luke* 12. 56, 57. *Luke* 21. 30. 2 *Cor.* 3. 5.

Argument IV.

HE that heareth from another what he ſhall ſpeak, is not God. The Holy Spirit doth ſo. *Ergo.*

The *Minor* is plain from the fore-cited place, *John* 16. 13. The *Major* is proved thus: He that is taught, is not God. He that heareth from another, what he ſhall ſpeak, is taught. *Ergo.*

The *Major* is clear by *Iſa.* 40. 13, 14. compared with *Rom.* 11. 34. 1 *Cor.* 2. 16. For theſe places of the Apoſtle, compared with that of the Prophet, ſhew that *Iſaiah* did not by *the Spirit of the Lord* there underſtand the Holy Spirit, but the Mind, or Intention of God. The *Minor* is evidenced by *John* 8. where our Saviour having ſaid in the 26*th* Verſe, *Whatſoever I have heard from him (the Father) theſe things I ſpeak*; in the 28*th* Verſe he expreſſeth the ſame ſenſe thus; *According as the Father hath taught me, theſe things I ſpeak.* Neither let any Man go about to elude ſo pregnant an Argument, by ſaying that this is ſpoken of the Holy Spirit improperly: For let him turn himſelf every way, and ſcrew the words as he pleaſes, yet ſhall he never be able to make it out to a wiſe and conſidering Man, how it can poſſibly be ſaid, that any one heareth from another what he will ſpeak, who is the prime Author of his Speech, and into whom it is not at a certain time inſinuated by another. For this Expreſſion plainly intimateth, that whatſoever the Holy Spirit ſpeaketh to the Diſciples, is firſt diſcovered and committed to him by Chriſt, whoſe Embaſſador he is, it being proper to an Embaſſador to be the Interpreter not of his own, but of another's Will. But it is contradictious to imagine that the moſt High God can have any thing diſcovered and committed to him by another.

Argument V.

He that receiveth of anothers, is not God. The Holy Spirit doth ſo. *Ergo.*

The *Minor* is witneſſed by the aforeſaid place, *John* 16. 14. The *Major* is proved thus: God is he that giveth all things to all; wherefore if there be any one that receiveth of anothers, he cannot be God. The Antecedent is plain by *Acts* 17. 25. *Rom.* 11. 35, 36. The Conſequence is undeniable: for if God ſhould give all things to all, and yet receive of anothers, he would both give all things, and not give all things; have all things of his own, and have ſomething of anothers; both which imply a Contradiction. The *Major* of the Proſyllogiſm is otherwiſe urged, thus: He that is dependent, is not God. He that receiveth of anothers is dependent: *Ergo.* The *Major* is unqueſtionable: for, to ſay one is dependent, and yet God, is in effect to ſay he is God, and not God, which implieth a Contradiction. The *Major* alſo is evident; for to receive of anothers, is the Notion of Dependency.

Argument VI.

He that is ſent by another, is not God. The Holy Spirit is ſent by another. *Ergo.*

The *Minor* is plain from the fore-quoted place, *Joh.* 16. 7. The *Major* is evinced thus: He that miniſtreth, is not God. He that is ſent, miniſtreth: *Ergo.*

The *Major* is indubitable, it being diſſonant to the ſupream Majeſty of God to miniſter, and ſerve another; for that were to be God and not God; to exerciſe Soveraign Dominion over all, and not to exerciſe it. The *Minor* is confirmed by *Heb.* 1. *ult.* where the Divine Author ſheweth, that the Angels are all miniſtring Spirits, in that they are ſent forth; as he before intimateth Chriſt to be Lord, becauſe he ſitteth at the Right-hand of [illegible] Soveraignty of God, in ſaying that he ſitteth in Heaven. The *Minor* is further proved thus:

He that receiveth a Command for the performance of ſomething, doth miniſter:

He that is ſent forth, receiveth a Command for the performance of ſomething: *Ergo.*

The *Major* is evident to common Senſe, ſince it ſuteth with none but Miniſters and Inferiours to receive Commands. The *Minor* is manifeſted by *John* 12. 49. *The Father that hath ſent me, he gave me a Command what I ſhall ſpeak.* Neither let any Man here reply, that this very thing is ſpoken alſo of Chriſt, unleſs, having firſt proved that Chriſt is ſupream God, he will grant that whatſoever is ſpoken of him, is ſpoken of him as God; or can make good that to be ſent at leaſt may agree to him as God. The contrary whereof I ſuppoſe I have clearly proved in this Argument, ſhewing that it is unſutable to the Divine Majeſty.

Argument VII.

He that is the Gift of God, is not God. The Holy Spirit is the Gift of God. *Ergo.*

The *Minor* is plain by *Acts* 12. 17. *Foraſmuch then as God gave them the like Gift* (meaning the Spirit) *as he did unto us, who have believed on the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, was I one that could withſtand God?* The *Major*, though of it ſelf ſufficiently clear, is yet further evidenced thus:

He that is not the Giver of all things, is not God.

He that is the Gift of God, is not the Giver of all things: *Ergo.*

The *Major* is apparent from *Acts* 17 25. *God giveth to all Life, Breath, and all things.* The *Minor* is proved thus:

He that is himſelf given, is not the Giver of all things:

He that is the Gift of God, is himſelf given: *Ergo.*

[illegible] is undeniable, for otherwiſe the ſame would be the Giver of all things,

and yet not the Giver of all things, inasmuch as he himself, a principal thing, is given, which implieth a Contradiction. The *Minor* needeth no Proof. Moreover, a Gift is in the Power, and at the disposal of the Giver; but it is gross and absurd to imagin that God can be in the Power, or at the disposal of another. Neither let any Man here think to evade, by saying, that not the Holy Spirit himself, but only his Gifts are imparted to Men; since both the more learned Adversaries themselves confess, that the Person of the Holy Spirit is given together with his Gifts, and the Scripture putteth the matter out of doubt, if you consult *Neh.* 9. 20. and *Rom.* 5. 5. In both which places, the Holy Spirit is said to be given contradistinctly from his Gifts and Operations: in the first, contradistinctly from the Instruction flowing from him; in the other, contradistinctly from the Love of God diffused in our Hearts by him. Whence we my draw this Corollary, That if the Person of the Holy Spirit be out of Favour given to certain Men, as the aforesaid places testify, then he was not personally present with them before, and consequently, by the Concession of the Adversaries themselves, cannot be God, since they will not deny that God is always personally present with all alike. But I foresta the following Argument.

Argument VIII.

He that changeth place, is not God. The Holy Spirit changeth place. *Ergo.*

The *Major* is plain: for if God should change place, he would cease to be where he was before, and begin to be where he was not before; which everteth his Omnipresence, and consequently, by the Confession of the Adversaries themselves, his Deity.

The *Minor* is ocularly apparent, if following the * Advice of the Adversaries, you will but [illegible] you shall have the Holy Spirit in a bodily Shape descending from Heaven, which is the *terminus à quo*; and alighting upon Christ, which is the *terminus ad quem*, Luk. 3. 21, 22. Joh. 1. 32. Neither let any Man alledg, that as much is spoken of God, *Exod.* 3. and *Chap.* 20. and *Gen.* 18. For if you compare *Acts* 7. 30, 35, 38, 53. *Gal.* 3. 19. *Heb.* 2. 2, 3. and *Chap.* 13. 2. with the foresaid places, you shall find, that it was not God himself that came down, but only an Angel, sustaining the Person and Name of God; which hath no place in the History touching the descent of the Holy Spirit.

* *Abi, Ariane, ad Jordanem, & Trinitatem vide.*

Argument IX.

He that prayeth unto Christ, to come to Judgment, is not God. The Holy Spirit doth so. *Ergo.*

The *Major* is granted. The *Minor* is evident from *Revel.* 22. 17. compared with the 12*th* Verse. Neither let any Man think to elude this Proof, by saying, that the Spirit is here said to pray, only because he maketh the Bride to pray: for when the Scripture would signify the Assistance of the Holy Spirit in causing Men to speak, it is wont to affirm, either that the Holy Spirit speaketh in them, as *Mat.* 10. 20. or that they spake by the Holy Spirt, as *Rom.* 8. 15. *We have received the Spirit of Adoption, by whom we cry, Abba, Father.* But here it is expresly said, that *the Spirit* and *the Bride say, Come*; not the Spirit *in* the Bride, nor the Bride *by* the Spirit.

Argument X.

He in whom Men have not believed, and yet have been Disciples and Believers, is not God. Men have not believed in the Holy Spirit, and yet have been so. *Ergo.*

The *Major* is plain: for how can they be Disciples and Believers, according to the [illegible]

him that is God? The *Minor* is proved thus: Men have not ſo much as heard whether there were an Holy Spirit, and yet have been Diſciples and Believers: *Ergo.* They have not believed in the Holy Spirit, and yet have been Diſciples and Believers.

The Antecedent is apparent from *Acts* 19. 2. The Conſequence is grounded on that of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 10. 14. [*How ſhall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard?*] Now if any Man, to decline the dint of this Argument, ſhall ſay, that by Holy Spirit in theſe words [Ἀλλ' οὐδ' εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιόν ἐστιν ἠκούσαμεν] is meant not the Perſon, but the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. He, beſides that he perverteth the plain and genuine meaning of the words, and ſpeaketh without Example*; doth alſo evacuate the Emphaſis of the Particles ἀλλ' οὐδ', which imply that theſe Diſciples were ſo far from having received the Gifts of the Holy Spirit, whereof we may without Prejudice to our Cauſe, grant that the Queſtion made mention, that they had not ſo much as heard whether there were an holy Spirit or not. Again, that the holy Spirit is not God, doth further appear by this very Inſtance, ſince the Apoſtle, when there was ſo ample an occaſion offered to declare it (if it had been ſo) doth quite decline it: for it is incredible that he, who was ſo intent and vigilant in propagating the Truth, as that caſually ſeeing an Altar at *Athens* inſcribed, *To the unknown God*, he preſently took a hint from thence, to preach unto the Heathen the true God; yet here being told by Diſciples that they had not ſo much as heard whether there were an holy Spirit, or not, ſhould not make uſe of the opportunity to diſcover unto them, and in them to us, the Deity of the holy Spirit, but ſuffer them to remain in Ignorance touching a Point of ſuch conſequence, that without the knowledg thereof (if we believe many now a-days) Men cannot be ſaved. Certainly, the Apoſtle had a greater care both of the Truth of God, and the Salvation of Men, than to do ſo.

* *For when the Verb Subſtantive* to be *is joyned with the holy Spirit, it ſignifieth his Being or Perſon, and the Gifts iſſuing from him.*

Argument XI.

HE that hath an Underſtanding diſtinct from that of God, is not God. The Holy Spirit hath an Underſtanding diſtinct from that of God. *Ergo.*

The *Major* is clear: for he that hath an Underſtanding diſtinct from that of another, muſt needs likewiſe have a diſtinct Eſſence, wherein that Underſtanding may reſide. The *Major* is proved thus: He that heareth from God at the ſecond hand, namely, by Chriſt Jeſus, what he ſhall ſpeak, hath an Underſtanding diſtinct from that of God. The Holy Spirit ſo heareth from God: *Ergo.*

The *Minor* is evident from *Joh.* 16. 13, 14, 15. The *Major* is confirmed thus: He that is taught of God, hath an Underſtanding diſtinct from that of God. He that heareth from God what he ſhall ſpeak, is taught of God: *Ergo.*

The *Minor* is manifeſt from *Joh.* 8. where our Saviour Chriſt having ſaid in Verſe 26. *Whatſoever I have heard from him* (the Father) *theſe things I ſpeak.* In Verſe 28. he expreſſeth the ſame ſenſe thus: [*According as the Father hath taught me, theſe things I ſpeak.*] The *Major* is of it ſelf clear: for he that is taught, hath an unknowing Underſtanding, ſince none can be taught what he knoweth already; and he that teacheth, hath a knowing Underſtanding, otherwiſe he could not teach another ſomething; but it implieth a Contradiction, that the ſame Underſtanding ſhould at the ſame time be both knowing and unknowing of the ſame thing. Beſides, that the Holy Spirit hath an Underſtanding diſtinct from that of God, is eaſily deducible from the words of the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 2. 10. where he affirmeth, *that the Spirit ſearcheth the depths of God* (as *Rom.* 8. 27. he intimateth, *that God ſearcheth the Heart of the Spirit:*) but to ſearch the depths of any one, neceſſarily

rily ſuppoſeth one underſtanding in him that ſearcheth, and another underſtanding in him whoſe Depths are ſearched, as is evident, not only by collation of other places of the Scripture, as 1 *Pet.* 1. 11. *Rev.* 2. 23. but even by common ſenſe, dictating to every Man ſo much, that none can, without abſurdity, be ſaid to ſearch the depths of his own underſtanding. Whence the Apoſtle going about to illuſtrate what he had ſpoken of the Spirit of God, by a ſimilitude drawn from the Spirit of a Man, doth not ſay, that the Spirit of a Man doth *ſearch*, but know the things of a Man, though his former words did ſeem to lead him thereunto.

Argument XII.

He that hath a Will diſtinct in number from that of God, is not God. The Holy Spirit hath a Will diſtinct in number from that of God. *Ergo.*

The *Major* is irrefragable. The *Minor* is aſſerted thus.

He that willeth conformably to the Will of God, hath a Will diſtinct in number from that of God.

The Holy Spirit ſo willeth: *Ergo.*

The *Major* is plain; for conformity muſt be between twain at leaſt, elſe it will not be Conformity, but Identity. The *Minor* is confirmed by *Rom.* 8. 26, 27. *Likewiſe the Spirit alſo helpeth our Infirmities; for we know not what to pray for as we ought, but the Spirit himſelf maketh interceſſion for us, with groans unutterable: But he that ſearcheth the Hearts, knoweth the Mind of the Spirit; for he maketh interceſſion for the Saints, according to the Will of God.* Neither let any Man here reply, that there is no mention made in the Greek, either of the Will of the Spirit, or of the Will of God: For, firſt, the word *intercede*, which ſignifieth to make ſuit for ſomething, implieth both the Will of him that maketh the Suit, for if he did not will the thing, he would not make ſuit for it; and alſo the Will of him to whom the Suit is made; for were he not endued with a Will, it would be bootleſs to make ſuit unto him, all Suits whatſoever being made to bend the Will of him to whom they are made: So that this, without any more, ſufficiently ſheweth that the Holy Spirit hath a Will diſtinct in number from that of God; ſince the one ſueth, the other is ſued at the ſame time, and for the ſame thing. Secondly, the word φρόνημα, in Engliſh rendred *Mind*, doth here ſignify the ſame with Will or Deſire, as appeareth from the 6*th* and 7*th* Verſes of this Chapter; and alſo from the Verb φρονεῖν, whence it is derived, which ſignifieth to *Affect*, *Will*, *Deſire*, *Purſue*; ſee Verſe 5. of the ſame Chapter, and *Col.* 3. 2. Thirdly, Though the Greek hath κατὰ Θεὸν, *according to God*; yet is this, in the judgment of the Engliſh Tranſlators themſelves, the ſame as if it had been ſaid, κατὰ τὸ θέλημα Θεοῦ, *according to the Will of God*; neither can any other commodious Interpretation be put upon the words.

But this Paſſage of the Apoſtle, doth further afford us a ſecond and third impregnable Argument of the Holy Spirit's being inferiour to God. For, firſt, he is here ſaid *to make interceſſion for us*, (as we before urged his praying to Chriſt, *Argument* 9.) and that *with groans unutterable*; which is not ſo to be underſtood, as if the Holy Spirit were here ſaid to help our Infirmities, only by ſuggeſting Petitions and Groans unto us, (as is *commonly*, but *falſly* affirmed) for the very words of the Context ſufficiently exclude ſuch a gloſs; ſince they ſay, *that the Spirit himſelf*, not *we by the Spirit*, (as we have it in the 15*th* Verſe of the ſame Chapter) *maketh interceſſion for us*; yea, *vicarious interceſſion*, as the Greek word ὑπερεντυγχάνει ſignifieth: But to help others Infirmities, *by making interceſſion*; and, what is more, *vicarious interceſſion for them*, is not to inſtil Petitions into them, but to pour out Petitions apart in their behalf; as is apparent both from the thing it ſelf; ſince none can intercede for himſelf, all Interceſſion (at leaſt ſuch as is here ſpoken of) requiring the entermiſe of a third Perſon; and by the Collation of Verſe 34 of the ſame Chapter, and 1 *Tim.* 2. 1.

Heb.

Heb. 7. 25. Neither let any Man think to baffle off this place, (which is written with a Beam of the Sun, and hath, together with that *John* 16. 13, 14. quite nonpluſs'd, not only Modern Authors, but the Fathers themſelves) by ſaying, that this is improperly ſpoken of the Holy Spirit: For, beſides, that he hath no other ground to ſay ſo, but his own pre-conceived Opinion touching the Deity of the Holy Spirit, he ought to know that the Scripture, though it ſpeaketh ſome things of God in a Figure, and improperly; yet doth it no where ſay any thing that argueth his Inferiority *to*, and dependance *on* another. But this Paſſage of the Apoſtle plainly intimateth, that the Holy Spirit is inferiour to God, and dependent on him; otherwiſe what need had he to make interceſſion to God, and that with groans unutterable, for the Saints? Secondly, The Holy Spirit is here diſtinguiſhed from *him that ſearcheth the Hearts*; and this Deſcription is made uſe of to put a difference between God and the Holy Spirit: But how could this be done, were the Holy Spirit alſo a ſearcher of the Hearts? For can a Deſcription that is common, yea alike common to twain, (for ſo the Adverſaries hold concerning God, and the Holy Spirit) be ſet to diſtinguiſh the one from the other? For inſtance; *to prepare the Paſſover for Chriſt*, is an Action common to *Peter* with *John*, for they twain were ſent by Chriſt to that purpoſe, and did accordingly perform it; ſee *Luke* 22. 8, 13. Wherefore can a Deſcription taken from this Action, be fit to difference *Peter* from *John*? And is it ſuitable to ſay, *He that prepared the Paſſover for Chriſt, was a greater Apoſtle than* John? Would not this plainly argue, that *John* did not prepare the Paſſover for Chriſt? So that it is apparent, that the Holy Spirit is not a ſearcher of the Hearts. If therefore, it would not follow that the Holy Spirit is God, although it had been ſaid in the Scripture, that he ſearcheth the Hearts, unleſs he had ſuch a faculty originally, and of himſelf, (for nothing hinders but that God may confer it upon others, as we ſee by the Scripture, that he hath, *de facto*, conferred it on Chriſt, *having given him all Judgment*, and that, *becauſe he is the Son of Man*, John 5. 22, 27. for ſuch Judgment requireth that he be a ſearcher of the Hearts); If, I ſay, it would not even then follow that he is God; how clearly, how irrefragably doth it on the contrary follow, that he is not God, but hath an underſtanding diſtinct *from*, and inferiour *to* that of God; in as much as he is deſtitute of ſuch a perfection, as the ſearching of the Hearts, which is inſeparable from the Divine Majeſty? Theſe two Conſiderations have I added at the cloſe of my twelfth Argument, becauſe they are not ſo much new Arguments, as Props and further Confirmations of the Ninth and Eleventh Arguments.

An Expoſition of *Matth.* 28. 19.

GO ye therefore, and make all the Nations Diſciples, (ſo the Original hath it) *baptizing them into the Name* (ſo it is alſo in the Original) *of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to obſerve whatſoever I have commanded you.*

Into the Name of the Holy Spirit; that is, *into the Holy Spirit*, by a circumlocution uſual in the Scripture: ſee *Act.* 19. 5. *And when they had heard, they were baptized into the Name of the Lord Jeſus:* compared with *Rom.* 6. 3. *Know ye not, that as many of us as have been baptized into Chriſt, have been baptized into his Death?* And *into the Holy Spirit*, that is, *into the guidance of the Holy Spirit.* Thus the Jews are ſaid *to have been all baptized into* Moſes, (for ſo the Greek hath it) 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. So that our Saviour's Words amount to thus much; *Initiating them into the Confeſſion and Obedience of God the Father; and of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt the Son of the Father; and of the Holy Spirit the Advocate and Guide of all the Truth.* Now the Holy Spirit is mentioned together with God and Chriſt, becauſe he is their chief Inſtrument, whereby they guide, govern, ſanctify, and endow the Church; and to intimate, that whereas Men, before they gave their Names to Chriſt, lived according to the Prince of this World, the unclean Spirit, that worketh in the Children of Diſobedience; they ought henceforth, being ſequeſtred from the World, and admitted into the Church, to reſign up themſelves to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, whom God and Chriſt appoint, and ſend to order and direct the Church. Neither can it be rightly inferred, that becauſe the Holy Spirit is here ranked with the Father and the Son, therefore he is equal to them. By this Account, when the Apoſtle, 1 *Tim.* 5. 21. ſaith, *I charge thee* (Gr. I obteſt) *before God, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the Elect Angels, that thou obſerve theſe things without prejudice, doing nothing by partiality:* joining the Elect Angels with the Father and the Son, in ſo great a matter as Obteſtation, to excite an Evangeliſt to do his Duty with ſincerity; this would imply, that the Elect Angels are equal to the Father and the Son. Nor doth it follow, that becauſe it is ſaid, not *into the Names*, but *into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*; therefore they three have but one Name, Power, or Dignity; ſince by the like reaſoning I might argue, that becauſe Chriſt, *Luke* 9. 26. ſaith, *Whoſoever ſhall be aſhamed of me, and of my words, of him ſhall the Son of Man be aſhamed, when he ſhall come in the Glory of himſelf*, (ſo it is in the Greek) *and of the Father, and of the Holy Angels*; therefore the Father, the Son, and the Holy Angels, have but one and the ſelf-ſame Glory. For that the Holy Spirit is not ranked with the Father, and the Son, as being equal to them, is evident by other punctual places of the Scripture, as 1 *Cor.* 12. 3, 4, 5, 6. *Epheſ.* 4. 4, 5, 6. where when the mention of him is joined with that of the Father, and of the Son, he is expreſly and emphatically excluded from being either *that one God, or that one Lord* of Chriſtians, by being contradiſtinguiſhed from both: But if he be neither *that one God*, nor *that one Lord of Chriſtians*; as the Apoſtle, not only in the fore-quoted places, but elſewhere alſo plainly teſtifieth; ſee 1 *Cor.* 8. 5, 6. *Yet to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all the things, and we for him; and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all the things, and we by him:* He cannot be equal to the Father, and the Son, but is only the chief Miniſter of both, peculiarly ſent out to miniſter on their behalf that ſhall inherit Salvation.

An

An Expoſition of 1 *John* 5. 7.

FOr there are three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and theſe three are one.

It would have been hard, if not impoſſible (had not Men been precorrupted) that it ſhould ever come into any ones head to imagine, that this Phraſe [*are one*] did ſignify [*have one Eſſence,*] ſince ſuch an Expoſition is not only contrary to common Senſe, but alſo to other places of the Scripture, wherein this kind of ſpeaking perpetually ſignifieth an Union in Conſent and Agreement, or the like, but never an Union in Eſſence. To omit other ſacred Writers, this very Apoſtle in his Goſpel, *Chap.* 17. *ver.* 11, 21, 22, 23. uſeth the ſame Expreſſion ſix times, intimating no other but an Union of Agreement; yea, in *ver.* 8. of this very Chapter in his Epiſtle, he uſeth it in the ſame ſenſe. For tho the Expreſſion varieth ſomewhat in the ordinary Greek Teſtaments, in that the Preposition [εἰς] is prefixed (altho the Complutenſian Bible readeth it [εἰς τὸ ἓν εἶναι] in both Verſes,) yet is the ſenſe the ſame; this latter being ſpoken after the Hebrew Idiom, the former according to the ordinary Phraſe. For Confirmation whereof, ſee *Mat.* 19. comparing Ver. 5 and 6, together in the Original: Wherefore this Expreſſion ought to be rendred alike in both Verſes, as the former Interpreters did it, tho the latter Interpreters in Verſe 8, have rendred it [*agree in one*] putting the Gloſs inſtead of the Tranſlation. So that this place maketh nothing for them that hold the Holy Spirit to have one and the ſame Eſſence with the Father, unleſs they can prove that thoſe who are one in Agreement muſt likewiſe neceſſarily be one in Eſſence; or that two or three cannot be one, but it muſt preſently be in Eſſence. I omit for the preſent to ſpeak of the Suſpectedneſs of this place, how it is not extant in the ancient Greek Copies, and namely in that famous one of *Trela* here in *England*, nor in the Syriack Tranſlation, nor in moſt ancient Books of the Latin Edition, and rejected by ſundry Interpreters both Ancient and Modern.

An Expoſition of *Acts* 5. 3, 4.

BUt Peter *ſaid*, Ananias, *why hath Satan filled thy Heart to lie to* (or *deceive*) *the Holy Spirit, and keep back part of the Price of the Farm? While it remained, remained it not to thee? and being ſold, was it not in thine own Power? why haſt thou conceived* (or *put*, or *purpoſed*) *in thy Heart this thing? thou haſt not lied to Men, but to God.*

In this Paſſage, the Holy Spirit is neither expreſly (as every one ſeeth) nor by good Conſequence called God. For admit the ordinary Tranſlation were true, (as it is not) yet would it not preſently follow, becauſe *Ananias* by lying to Men endued with the Holy Spirit, (for even *Piſcator* in the words acknowledgeth, and the words themſelves, according to this Interpretation, imply a Metonymy of the Adjunct, the Holy Spirit being put for Men endued with the Holy Spirit) lied not to Men, but to God, that therefore the Holy Spirit is God; becauſe in lying to them that are indued with the Spirit of God, one may lie to God, and yet neither they, nor the Spirit in them, be God, but only the Meſſengers of God; for what is done to the Meſſengers, redoundeth

to him that ſends them; ſee 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 8. *Joh.* 13. 20. *Luk.* 10. 16. But if any Man look more narrowly into the words, he ſhall find that the Verb ψεύσασθαι is conſtrued in a different manner, namely with an Accuſative, *ver.* 3. and with a Dative, *ver.* 4. with an Accuſative it ſignifieth in Greek Authors, *to bely, pretend,* or *counterfeit*; thus *Lucian* in his *Pſeudomantis,* ψευσάμενός τι ὄνομα, nomen quoddam mentitus, *counterfeiting a certain Name.* This being ſo, the words are to be rendred thus; *Why hath Satan filled thy Heart, to bely the Holy Spirit, and keep back part of the Price?* (that is, *Why haſt thou ſuffered the unclean Spirit ſo to prevail with thee, as that thou ſhouldeſt ſell thy Farm, and lay down this Money at his Suggeſtion, as appeareth in that thou haſt purloined part of the Price, and not laid down all; and yet to bear us in hand, that thou didſt it at the motion of the Holy Spirit?*) *thou haſt not lied to Men, but to God:* (that is, *aſſure thy ſelf that this Diſſimulation of thine, is not ſo much to us, as to God himſelf, whoſe Servants we are.*) This Expoſition is not only agreeable to the Greek Context, and ſcope of the place, but is alſo ſeconded by *Eraſmus, Calvin,* and *Aretius.* But if any Man will contend, that though ψεύσασθαι be not here rendred *to lie unto* (as I have not yet met with an Inſtance where it is ſo rendred, when an Accuſative is put after it;) yet the other Signification, ſet in the Margin of our Engliſh Bible, is altogether to be admitted (and I confeſs I have in good Greek Authors found the word ſo uſed) and the place to be rendred, *Why hath Satan filled thy Heart to deceive the Holy Spirit?* This will overthrow the Opinion, touching the God-head of the Holy Spirit: For if the Holy Spirit be God, then will it be all one as if it had been ſaid, *Why hath Satan filled thy Heart to deceive God?* Which ſeemeth to be Blaſphemy; for it importeth, either that God may be deceived, or elſe that Satan, or at leaſt *Ananias* thought ſo, otherwiſe he would not have purpoſed in his Heart to do it. But what force or uſe (if this Interpretation of ψεύσασθαι be admitted) will thoſe words have, *And to keep back part of the Price?* and alſo thoſe, *While it remained, remained it not to thee? and being ſold, was it not in thy Power?* For theſe Expreſſions argue, that *Ananias* pretended to have received a Command from the Holy Spirit to ſell his Farm, and lay down the Price thereof at the Apoſtles Feet; and ſo did not *deceive,* or *lie to,* but *bely* the Holy Spirit; and conſequently, was guilty not only of Covetouſneſs, in keeping ſome of the Money back, but alſo of Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Spirit, in fathering upon the Holy Spirit, that which was injected into his Heart by the unclean Spirit: For he alike blaſphemeth the Holy Spirit, who doth with *Ananias* wilfully father the Works of the Devil upon the Holy Spirit, as he who with the Phariſees, *Mat.* 12. 24. wilfully aſcribeth the Works of the Holy Spirit to the Devil.

An Expoſition of 1 *Cor.* 6. 19, 20.

WHat? Know ye not that your Body is the Temple of the Holy Spirit that is (or, *dwelleth*) *in you, whom ye have from God, and ye are not your own? for ye have been bought with a Price. Wherefore glorify God both with your Body, and your Spirit, which are God's.*

Whereas it is objected by ſome, out of this place, that the Holy Spirit is God, in that our Body is ſaid *to be his Temple.* I anſwer, that it would follow, could it be proved that our Body is ſo *the Temple of the Holy Spirit,* as to be his by the higheſt Intereſt, and primarily dedicated to his Honour; for every one will confeſs our Body to be God's in ſuch a manner. But theſe things are ſo far

far from being intimated in this Paſſage, yea that our Body is *at all* his by Intereſt, or dedicated to his Honour, (both which are here affirmed of God contradiſtinctly from the Spirit) as that the contrary may from hence not obſcurely be evinced. For after the Apoſtle had hinted in what reſpect our Body is the Temple of the Holy Spirit, to wit, by Inhabitation (for ſo much is implied by thoſe words, *that in*, or *dwelleth in you*; ſince Deſcriptions in ſacred Writers are not idle and impertinent) he addeth *that we have the Spirit from God*, thereby implying that he is diſpoſed of, and given by God to us, and conſequently he is ours by Intereſt, not we his; and accordingly concludeth from thence, that we ought with our Body to glorify, not *the Spirit*, but *God*, who is openly diſtinguiſhed from the Spirit, and declared to be the Proprietor of our Body.

An Expoſition of *Matth.* 12. 31.

ALL Sin and Blaſphemy ſhall be forgiven unto Men; but the Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Spirit ſhall not be forgiven.

For the Objection drawn from hence, That the Sin againſt the Holy Spirit is unpardonable. I anſwer, that the Sin againſt the Holy Spirit is not therefore unpardonable, becauſe he is God (for this the Scripture no where acknowledgeth; and beſides, by the ſame reaſon, every Sin againſt God would be unpardonable:) but becauſe he that ſinneth againſt the Holy Spirit, doth in the ſame Act ſin againſt God (for every Sin, againſt whomſoever committed, is terminated in God) with an high hand, to wit, either by ſlandering and oppoſing ſuch Works, whereof a Man is convinced in Conſcience that God hath wrought them by the Holy Spirit, as the Phariſees did; or by renouncing and oppoſing ſuch Truths, whereof a Man is convinced in Conſcience, that God hath revealed them by his Holy Spirit, as the *Renegadoes* did, who are mentioned by the Author to the *Hebrews*, Chap. 10. 25, 26, *&c.* which things are the greateſt Affronts that can be offered to God, who uſeth the Miniſtery of the Spirit in none but things of the higheſt importance, and maketh the cleareſt Diſcovery of himſelf, as to his Power and Majeſty, by him. Hence it cometh to paſs, that a Sin againſt the Father or the Son may be forgiven, but not a Sin againſt the Holy Spirit, inaſmuch as it is alſo againſt the greateſt Light. For God the Father maketh no Diſcovery of himſelf to the World immediately; and Chriſt, to prove his Authority and Miſſion from God, appealeth to the Works which he did by the Finger of God, the Holy Spirit; ſee *Luke* 11. 20. compared with *Mat.* 12. 28. Wherefore I retort this Argument againſt the Adverſaries, as quite ſubverting their Opinion touching the Godhead of the Holy Spirit: For if the Holy Spirit were God, you would commit no Sin, but what would be againſt the Holy Spirit, in that all Sins are committed againſt God, as being the Tranſgreſſions of his Law. Again, when we ſinned againſt the Father, we muſt of neceſſity alſo ſin againſt the Holy Spirit, if he be the ſame God with the Father. For as the Adverſaries hold that the Works of the Trinity *ad extra*, that is, *to without*, are common to all three: ſo muſt they by the ſame reaſon confeſs, that whatſoever is done to any one of them *ab extra*, that is, *from without*, is alſo common to all three.

An Expoſition of *Iſa.* 6. 9, 10.

AND *he ſaid, Go and tell this People, Hear ye indeed, but underſtand not; and ſee ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the Heart of this People fat, and make their Ears heavy, and ſhut their Eyes; leſt they ſee with their Eyes, and hear with their Ears, and underſtand with their Heart, and convert, and be healed.*] Compared with *Acts* 28. 25, 26, 27. *Well ſpake the Holy Spirit by* Iſaias *the Prophet, unto our Fathers, ſaying, Go unto this People, and ſay, Hearing ye ſhall hear, and ſhall not underſtand,* &c.

Becauſe that which in *Iſaiah* is attributed to the Lord, is in the *Acts* aſcribed to the Holy Spirit; the Adverſaries hence conclude, that the Holy Spirit is the Lord. Which kind of arguing, though it be very frequent with them, is yet very frivolous; for at this rate I may alſo conclude, that becauſe what is attributed to the Lord, *Exod.* 32. 11. [*Lord, why doth thy Wrath wax hot againſt thy People, which thou haſt brought forth out of the Land of* Egypt?] is in the 7th Verſe of the ſame Chapter aſcribed to *Moſes*; [*And the Lord ſaid unto* Moſes, *Go, get thee down, for thy People which thou broughteſt out of the Land of* Egypt, *&c.*] therefore *Moſes* is the Lord. And becauſe what is attributed to the Lord, *Iſa.* 65. 1. [*I am ſought of them that asked not for me: I am found of them that ſought me not: I ſaid, Behold me, behold me, unto a Nation that was not called by my Name*], is in the 10th of the *Romans*, Verſe 20. aſcribed to *Iſaiah*: [*But* Iſaias *is very bold, and ſaith, I was found of them that ſought me not: I was made manifeſt unto them that asked not after me:*] therefore *Iſaiah* is the Lord. And becauſe what is attributed to God, 2 *Tim.* 1. 8, 9. [*According to the Power of God, who hath ſaved us, and called us,* &c.] is by *Paul* attributed to himſelf, 1 *Cor.* 9. 22. [*I am made all things to all Men, that I might by all means ſave ſome.*] And to *Timothy*, 1 Tim. 4. 16. [*In doing this, thou ſhalt both ſave thy ſelf, and them that hear thee:*] therefore *Paul*, yea *Timothy*, is God. If the Adverſaries ſay, that theſe things are otherwiſe aſcribed to the Lord, than to the Men aforeſaid: I anſwer, This is more than is held forth in the Texts themſelves, which neither expreſs nor intimate any ſuch thing. If they further contend, That though ſuch a thing be neither expreſſed nor intimated in the ſaid Texts, yet other Texts, and the nature of the thing it ſelf, doth ſufficiently teach it. I reply, That I can make the ſame Anſwer touching the Lord and the Holy Spirit. But it is well that there is ſuch an intimation in the Texts themſelves; for in the one, *the Lord ſpeaketh thoſe things to* Iſaiah *in a Viſion*; in the other it is ſaid, that *the Holy Spirit ſpake them by* Iſaiah *to the Fathers.* Which twain every one may eaſily perceive to be different, ſince *Iſaiah* only heard thoſe words in the Viſion: For had the Fathers, the People of *Iſrael*, been alſo there, why ſhould God bid *Iſaiah*, go and tell them to the People? Wherefore *Paul* aſcribeth theſe words to the Holy Spirit, only to intimate, that whatſoever is ſpoken in the Scripture, was recorded by the Inſpiration of the Holy Spirit, and ſo ſpoken by him.

An

An Expoſition of 2 *Cor.* 3. 17.

NOW *the Lord is that Spirit.*

By *that Spirit* is here meant the third Perſon of the HOLY TRINITY, otherwiſe the Lord, that is, Chriſt (for the Apoſtle *Paul*, by ὁ Κύριος, *the Lord*, doth always, unleſs he cite ſome place out of the Old Covenant, underſtand Chriſt) will be the Holy Spirit; which is repugnant to the Scripture, wherein there is a plain diſtinction every-where made between Chriſt and the Holy Spirit. Underſtand therefore (what the Expreſſion it ſelf implieth) the ſame Spirit that was before in the 6th Verſe oppoſed to the Letter, and conſequently the Myſtery, or hidden Senſe of the Law, denoted by the Letter: For thus the word Spirit is alſo taken, *Rom.* 2. 29. *Circumciſion is that of the Heart, in the Spirit, and not in the Letter.* And, *Rom.* 7. 6. *But now we are delivered from the Law, that being dead wherein we are held; ſo that we ſerve in the newneſs of the Spirit, and not in the oldneſs of the Letter.* And, *Rev.* 11. 8. *Their dead Bodies ſhall lie in the ſtreets of the great City, which ſpiritually is called* Sodom *and* Egypt, *where alſo our Lord was crucified. Jeruſalem* is here *ſpiritually*, that is *myſtically called* Sodom *and* Egypt, becauſe of the abominable filthineſs thereof, and cruelty towards the People of God. Wherefore the ſenſe of the words of *Paul* is this, namely, That *the Lord Chriſt is the Myſtery, Life, Scope, and Kernel of the Law, as being both foretold therein, and prefigured by the Ceremonies thereof.*

An Answer to the Grand Objection of the Adversaries, touching the supposed Omnipresence of the Holy Spirit.

After I had thorowly sifted this Controversy, I found that the Adversaries, who so much cry down Reason, saying, That we must renounce it when we speak of Divine Mysteries, and simply rest in the Words of the Scripture; do notwithstanding, in the upshot, wave the Scripture, as giving a very uncertain testimony to their Doctrine in this Point, and ground themselves on the meer conjectures of their own Reason. For thus they argue: The Holy Spirit, if he were not Omnipresent, and consequently God, could not inspire and dwell in so many Men at one time.

For answer hereunto, I will only ask them one Question, which if they resolve, I will then tell them how the Holy Spirit, though he be not Omnipresent, may inspire all the faithful in the World at one time. Our Saviour, in the 4th of *Mark*, explaining the Parable of the Sower, saith, in Verse 15. *And those are they by the Way-side, where the Word is sown: but when they have heard, Satan cometh immediately, and taketh the Word that was sown in their Hearts.* Suppose now that the Seed of the Word be sown in ten thousand places at one time, as it happeneth on every Lord's Day; How can Satan, whom the Adversaries will deny to be Omnipresent, come and immediately snatch the Word out of the Hearts of the greatest part of the Hearers? The same Resolution that they shall give to this Question, I will apply to their own Objection. If this be not sufficient, take yet more Proofs, that may seem to evince the Omnipresence of the unclean Spirit. Thus is he said *to have been a lying Spirit in the Mouth of four hundred false Prophets*, 1 King. 22. 22, 23. (and there is the same reason between four Hundred, and four Millions.) Thus is he said *to hold the Impenitent* (who make the greatest part of Mankind) *in his Snare, and to take them captive at his Will*, 2 Tim. 2. *ult.* *To blind the Minds of them that believe not*, 2 Cor. 4. 4. *To dwell in the Ungodly*, Rev. 1. 13. *To shew the Wicked whatsoever they practise*, John 8. 38. Yea, *to deceive the whole World*, Rev. 12. 9. & 20. 2, 3. If they dare not, for all this, to affirm the unclean Spirit to be Omnipresent, Why do they on less ground conclude the Omnipresence of the Holy Spirit, especially when the Scripture so plainly testifieth that he changeth place, as *John* 15. 26. *But when the Advocate is come, whom I will send you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth which proceedeth* (or, *goeth out*) *from the Father, he shall testify of me.* How could the Holy Spirit *be sent*, and *go out from the Father to the Disciples*, if he were already with them, and could not but stay with the Father? Gal. 4. 6. *Because ye are Sons, God hath sent out the Spirit of his Son into your Hearts, crying, Abba, Father.* This sheweth that the Spirit was not in their Hearts before, otherwise he needed not *to be sent out into them.* 1 Pet. 1. 12. *The things which are now reported unto you, by them that have preached the Gospel unto you, with the Holy Spirit sent down from Heaven.* Could the Holy Spirit be sent down from Heaven, if he were already upon the Earth, and continued still in Heaven? For, that the coming of the Holy Spirit down from Heaven

is properly to be taken, appeareth by the very ſight, in that *John* the Baptiſt *did ſee the Spirit deſcending from Heaven in a bodily ſhape like a Dove, and he abode on Chriſt*, John 1. 32. compared with *Luke* 3. 21, 22. where the words of the Scripture are diligently to be heeded; for it is not ſaid, that *the bodily Shape did deſcend*, but *the Spirit in the Shape*: So that the deſcent did primarily, and by it ſelf, agree to the Holy Spirit; but in a ſecondary way, and by accident, to the ſhape which he had aſſumed. Now is it poſſible to deſcend out of Heaven to the Earth, and not change place? Or is there any thing better than an ocular Demonſtration to evince a change of place? Certainly, if notwithſtanding all this, and much more which may be alledged, it is yet true that the Holy Spirit doth not go from place to place: What aſſurance can I have, when the Scripture ſaith, of any one whomſoever, *that he is ſent*, or *cometh down*, or *goeth out*, that he moveth from one place to another, and doth not abide where he was before? Neither is it rightly done by the Adverſaries, when againſt ſo many evident Scriptures they alleadg one obſcure Paſſage, *Pſal.* 139. 7, 8. *Whither ſhall I go from thy Spirit? or whither ſhall I flee from thy Preſence? If I aſcend up into Heaven, thou art there: If I make my Bed in Hell, behold thou art there.* For, to omit that the Pſalmiſt, as the precedent and ſubſequent words, yea, the Paſſage it ſelf cited at large doth ſhew, intendeth only to prove the Omnipreſence of God himſelf, and not of his Spirit; and that divers of the very Adverſaries, as namely the Divines of the Aſſembly in their Annotations on this place, do by *Spirit* here underſtand the *Knowledg* or *Power* of God, and not the Holy Spirit: Should it be granted that theſe words, *Whither ſhall I go from thy Spirit?* are meant of the Holy Spirit, yet do they import no more, than that *David* could go into no place, but the Spirit could be there with him; and ſo ſignify, not that he is in all places at one time, but can be in them at ſeveral times, accordingly as *David* ſhould come into them.

Again, ſhould it be further granted, (what the Adverſaries are not able to evince) that *David*'s meaning is, that he could go into no place where the Spirit was not preſent; yet would not this preſently argue, that he was there preſent in his Perſon or Subſtance, (as the Adverſaries conceive, when they ſay, that he is Omnipreſent, and therefore God) ſince it is ſufficient for the Truth hereof, that he is in every place by his Knowledg; ſo that a Man can be in no place whatſoever, but the Holy Spirit will know where he is. This Omnipreſence, which I verily believe belongeth to the Holy Spirit, doth not hinder him to go from one place to another. Yea, whoſoever diligently looketh into *David*'s words, ſhall find that he intended in this *Pſalm* to aſſert no other Omnipreſence to God himſelf, than that of Knowledg and Power. For he openly ſpeaketh of the Knowledg of God in the firſt ſix Verſes, ſaying in the ſecond of them, *Thou underſtandeſt my Thoughts afar off*. Which implieth that the Perſon or Subſtance of God himſelf was not upon the Earth with *David*, otherwiſe he would underſtand *David*'s Thoughts near at Hand, and not afar off. But in the tenth Verſe, which is an Explication of the three preceding ones, he ſpeaketh of the Hand of God, whereby is wont to be underſtood his Power. Afterwards, verſ. 11, and 12. he returneth to the Knowledg of God, whereof he had before ſpoken. Moreover, the main current of the Scripture runneth that way, and plainly intimateth, that the Perſon, or Subſtance, or Shape of God, (I ſpeak the Language of the Scripture; ſee *Job.* 13. 7. *Will ye accept his* (God's) *Perſon? will ye contend for God?* Heb. 1. 3. *Who being the Brightneſs of his* (God's) *Glory, and expreſs Image of his Perſon* (Gr. *Subſtance*) John 5. 37. *And the Father himſelf which hath ſent me, hath born witneſs of me. Ye have neither heard his Voice at any time, nor ſeen his Shape:*) is no where elſe but in Heaven. Neither let the Adverſaries reply, That if I aſcribe an univerſal Knowledg of Humane Affairs to the Holy Spirit, this very thing will evince him to be God.

God. For, first, I have already excepted the searching of the Heart, proving, in the twelfth Argument, that it agreeth not to the Holy Spirit. Secondly, Had the Holy Spirit an Universal Knowledg, as of other things, so also of the Heart, yet would not this prove him to be God, unless he had this Knowledg originally and of himself. For it is apparent from the Scripture, *John* 5. 22. that God hath given all Judgment unto Christ, and consequently all Knowledg, without which that Judgment cannot be managed. But if he hath given all Knowledg unto Christ, he can as well give it to the Holy Spirit: Wherefore, let the Adversaries, when they are driven from their Opinion, by that invincible Argument drawn from the Intercession which the Holy Spirit is said to make for the Saints, cease to take up the same Weapon, and contend, that the Holy Spirit, inasmuch as he maketh Intercession for the Saints, must needs know all their Wants, and so be God. For is not Christ also said to make Intercession for the Saints? and doth he not intercede with God as a Man, and so as a Man know all their Wants? But if Christ, as a Man, and so as a Creature, maketh Intercession unto God for the Saints, and knoweth all their Wants, why not the Holy Spirit also, though he be a created Spirit, and not God?

As for the dwelling of the Holy Spirit in so many Persons, though I might forbear to shew in what manner this is done, until the Adversaries had answered my Query, yet will I (for the satisfaction of such as are studious of the Truth) here declare it. He dwelleth therefore in all the Saints dispersed through the whole World, not in his Person or Substance, for then his Person or Substance would fill the World, and dwell in all Men a-like, whereas the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is by the Scripture made a peculiar Priviledg of the Saints, Rom. 8. 9. *But ye are not in the Flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be* (or *for*) *the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. Now if any Man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.* Wherefore he dwelleth in them by his Gifts, or Effects, (since no other dwelling can be imagined) which is an Expression frequent in the Writings of the Adversaries themselves, but that they are wont to forget it when they reason about the Godhead of the Holy Spirit.

FINIS.

A

Confession of Faith

Touching the

Holy Trinity,

According to the

SCRIPTURE.

Gal. 1. 8, 9. *But if we, or an Angel from Heaven* (how much more, *if Fathers, or Councils?*) *preach any thing unto you, besides what we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any one preach any thing unto you, besides what ye have received, let him be accursed.*

1 Joh. 2. 24. *Let that therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning: if that which ye have heard from the beginning abide in you, ye also shall abide in the Son, and in the Father.*

London; Printed in the Year, 1648, and Reprinted in the Year, 1691.

The PREFACE.

THough we might juſtly renew the old Complaint, That Truth is a Stranger in the Earth, *even in reſpect of ſundry things exceedingly importing the good of Human Society, yet ſhall we find, upon a diligent Examination of the matter, that this wayfaring condition of Truth hath in nothing more diſcloſed it ſelf, than in the Knowledg of the true God. For to omit the ſudden and general Revolt of the Nations to Idolatry, how unſtable and fleeting was this Knowledg even in* Iſrael *it ſelf, tho God had choſen that Nation above all others to be his People? The Hiſtory of the Old Covenant every where relateth how the* Iſraelites *went a whoring after Idols, and could by no means be held cloſe to the Lord their God. And it had been well for us, if this Fickleneſs of retaining God in Knowledg had not ſeized Chriſtians alſo, as formerly it did the Jews. But not only the Hiſtory of by-paſt Ages, but even the Experience of our own Times, abundantly ſheweth, how deeply Chriſtians themſelves are guilty of making a Defection from the true God, being ſo thickned on their Lees, that (did we not look unto the mighty Power of God, who only doth wondrous Works) we ſhould conceive it utterly impoſſible to clarify them from the Filth of their Superſtition. For tho* Luther *and* Calvin *deſerve much Praiſe for the Pains they took in cleanſing our Religion from ſundry Idolatrous Pollutions of the Roman Antichriſt, yet are the Dregs ſtill left behind, I mean the groſs Opinion touching three Perſons in God. Which Error not only made way for thoſe Pollutions, but lying at the bottom corrupteth almoſt our whole Religion. For firſt, it introduceth three Gods, and ſo ſubverteth the Unity of God, ſo frequently inculcated in the Scripture. Neither is it enough for the ſalving of this Abſurdity, to ſay with* Athanaſius, *that* tho the Father be God, the Son God, the Holy Spirit God; yet there are not three Gods, but one God: *For who is there (if at leaſt he dare make uſe of Reaſon in his Religion) who ſeeth not, that it is as ridiculous as if one ſhould ſay, Peter* is an Apoſtle, *James* an Apoſtle, *John* an Apoſtle, yet there are not three Apoſtles but one Apoſtle? *If the word* God, *taken for the moſt high God (as here it is) be predicated of three, it is an Univerſal (ſince not only* Ariſtotle, *but common Underſtanding ſheweth that to be an Univerſal, which may be predicated of many; that a ſingular, which cannot ſo be predicated) and conſequently there are three* Gods; *even as the word* Apoſtle *being an*

univerſal, and predicated of three, it unavoidably follows that there are three Apoſtles. Secondly, it hindreth us from praying according to the Preſcript of the Goſpel. For how can any Man pray to God through his Son Jeſus Chriſt, as the Goſpel directeth us to do, if God be not the Father only? Did God conſiſt of the three Perſons, would it not, when he invocated God, be all one as if he ſhould ſay, O Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, give me what I ask, through thy Son Jeſus Chriſt; *and ſo Chriſt be the Son not only of the Father, but alſo of the Holy Spirit, yea of himſelf? Again, how can any Man ask of God the Gift of the Holy Spirit, if God be not the Father only, or at moſt, the Father and the Son? Would it not, when he invocated God, be all one as if he ſhould ſay,* O Father, Son and Holy Spirit, give me your Holy Spirit, *and ſo the Holy Spirit be the Spirit, not only of the Father and the Son, but alſo of himſelf? Wherefore let him that entereth into any of our Churches to partake of the Publick Worſhip but obſerve, and he ſhall find that the Miniſters in their Prayers do by God, mean no other but the Father; for they uſually cloſe up their Petitions, deſiring God to grant what they have begged, for the ſake or Merits of his Son Jeſus Chriſt; thereby plainly giving us to underſtand, that by* God, *they meant the Father only. Which very thing, were there nothing elſe, doth abundantly ſhew the falſity of their Opinion touching three Perſons in God. Since after they have moſt virulently cried out both in the Pulpit and Preſs againſt the Opinion of* one God the Father, *they do nowithſtanding continually make uſe of the ſame in their Prayers, and cannot do otherwiſe. Thus having one while told Men that* once in Chriſt, and ever in Chriſt, *they do another while bid them take heed of back-ſliding, ſhewing them to that purpoſe the great danger they are in of being drawn away from Chriſt. Neither let the Adverſaries, to evade this great Difficulty, ſay, that when they pray unto God, through his Son, or for his Spirit, by God is meant but one of the three Perſons in the Godhead, namely the Father. For firſt, this is to beg the Queſtion; ſince to ſay that* God *is put for one of the three Perſons in the Godhead, is to take for granted that there are three Perſons in the Godhead. The contrary whereof is proved by the Argument which we have alledged. Neither will it be amiſs by the way to give notice, that when the Controverſy is about the ſupream Deity of the Son and Holy Spirit, the Adverſaries commonly anſwer by begging the Queſtion. For inſtance, if it be argued, that the Son cannot be the moſt high God,* becauſe he can do nothing of himſelf, becauſe all Authority in Heaven and Earth hath been given to him, becauſe the Father is greater than he: *it is preſently anſwered that theſe things are ſpoken of Chriſt according to his Human Nature only. Whereas this is to take for granted that Chriſt hath another Nature beſides his Humane Nature, namely, the Nature of the moſt high God; and ſo to beg*

the

the Queſtion. Again, when it is urged that the Holy Spirit is not the moſt high God, becauſe he alſo ſpeaketh not of himſelf, is ſent down from Heaven, maketh Interceſſion for the Saints with Groans unutterable. *The uſual Anſwer is, that theſe things are ſpoken after the manner of Men; or, as the Learned phraſe it,* ἀνθρωποπαθῶς, *whereby that is attributed to God, which doth not indeed agree to him, but only to Man. Whereas this alſo is to take for granted that the Holy Spirit is God, and ſo to beg the Queſtion. But ſecondly; Were it true that there are three Perſons in the Godhead, yet could not the word* God *be appropriated to one of them, all Appropriation being founded upon ſome Excellency and Prerogative that one hath above the reſt, who are otherwiſe of the ſame ſort. Which here cannot have place, becauſe the Adverſaries hold, that every Perſon of the Trinity is equally God with the others, and that none of them is either before, or greater than another. And indeed, it is impoſſible to conceive how any one ſhould any way have any Excellency and Prerogative above him that is the moſt high God. Thirdly, were it granted that the word* God *taken for the moſt high God, is appropriated to one of the three Perſons in the Godhead, yet could it at no hand be made uſe of to diſtinguiſh him from the other Perſons. For how ſhould a word, equally common unto three, not only be appropriated to one of them, but alſo be ſet to diſtinguiſh him from the others; ſince every one can tell that that which is to diſtinguiſh and difference one from another, muſt not be ſomething common unto both, but peculiar to one above the other? Wherefore I deſire the Adverſaries to confirm this way of diſtinguiſhing, which is ſo rife amongſt them, by a like Example taken either out of the Scripture, or out of ſome approved Author. But if they be deſtitute of Examples, let them at leaſt alledg ſome ſufficient Reaſon to evince, that tho ſuch diſtinguiſhing be not uſual, yet it is ſutable enough.*

In the third place; This Tenet of three Perſons in God, prohibiteth us to love and honour him as we ought. For the higheſt Love and Honour is due to him who is the moſt high God. But ſuch Love and Honour can be exhibited to no more than one Perſon. For Demonſtration, the higheſt Love and Honour is to be loved and honoured for himſelf, and all others for him. As the higheſt Good is that which is deſired for it ſelf, and all others for it. Suppoſe now (what I conceive will eaſily be granted; if not, the Scripture it ſelf will extort it, which giveth the Title of Moſt High to the Father, and thereby differenceth him both from Chriſt and the Holy Spirit; ſee Luke 1. 32, 35.*) ſuppoſe, I ſay, that the Father is to be loved and honoured with the higheſt Love and Honour; then muſt he be loved and honoured for himſelf, and all others for him. If all others, then alſo the Son and Holy Spirit. But if the Son and Holy Spirit be loved and honoured for another (as indeed the very Appellations of the Son and Spirit of God imply that the one was begotten, the other breathed from God, and ſo are*

beholden

beholden to another for their Being, and conſequently for the Love and Honour given to them) then are they not loved and honoured with the higheſt Love and Honour, and ſo are not the moſt High God, in that whoſoever is the moſt High God, ought to be loved and honoured in this manner, otherwiſe ſome other would have a Pre-eminence above him who is the moſt High God; which every one eaſily perceiveth to be contradictious. And bleſſed be God, who hath not left us to an uncertainty herein, having plainly told us that Chriſt is therefore to be honoured as the Father (it doth not ſay, as much as the Father*) not becauſe he hath the ſame Eſſence, and ſo is the ſame God with the Father, but* becauſe the Father hath given him all Judgment, *Joh.* 5. 22, 23. *and alſo delivers this as a general Rule, that* whoſoever loveth him that begat, loveth that alſo which is begotten of him, 1 *Joh.* 5. 2. *making the Love to the Father the ground and reaſon of the Love to the Son; and conſequently, the Love which we bare to Jeſus Chriſt, to ſpring from the Love we bare to God the Father, who hath given to him both his Being and Dignity, and whatſoever elſe is lovely in him (as indeed there is nothing in him but what is very lovely.) As for the Holy Spirit, tho much Love and Honour is without queſtion due to him, he being the Perſon to whom, under God and Chriſt, we are moſt beholden, as receiving from him the greateſt Benefits, yet are we no where in the Scripture expreſly enjoyned to love and honour him, (howbeit many, preferring ſuch a Doxology as was deviſed by Men, before that which is propoſed by God himſelf in his Word, commonly aſcribe Honour and Glory to the Holy Spirit together with God; which is the leſs to be wondred at, in as much as others ſtick not to aſcribe Honour and Glory to the Virgin* Mary *together with God:) and therefore what Love and Honour we are to exhibit unto him, is with great warineſs to be collected out of the Scripture, which not only ſaith that* He is of God, 1 *Cor.* 2. 12. *and ſo dependent on God for his Being; but alſo* glorifieth Chriſt, in that he receiveth of his, and declareth it to the Apoſtles, *Joh.* 16. 14. *and ſo is dependent not only on God, but alſo on Chriſt for his Knowledg in the Myſtery of the Goſpel, and therefore is inferior to our Lord Chriſt Jeſus. Which is alſo further evident by the Benefits which we receive from the Holy Spirit. For whereas he diſtributeth to us ſundry Spiritual Gifts, as Tongues, Prophecy, Miraculous Cures,* &c. 1 Cor. 12. 8, 9, 10. *Chriſt conferreth upon us Remiſſion of Sins,* Acts 10. 43. Col. 3. 13. *He is the Earneſt (or rather Pledg) of our Heavenly Inheritance,* Eph. 1. 13, 14. *Chriſt the Beſtower of the very Inheritance it ſelf,* Mat. 25. 34. Luke 22. 29. John 17. 2. *He aſſureth us that we are the Children of God,* Rom. 8. 16. *Chriſt giveth us the Priviledg to become the Children of God,* Joh. 1. 12. *He is given to us upon our Repentance,* Acts 2. 38. *Chriſt giveth us the very Repentance it ſelf,* Acts 5. 31.

In

In the fourth place, This Aſſertion of three Perſons in God, thwarteth the common Notion that all Men have of God. For our very Underſtanding ſuggeſteth to us, that God is the ſame with the firſt Cauſe of all Things, he only being of himſelf, and all others from him. *But if any Man, to uphold a prejudicate Opinion, will deny the Dictate of his Reaſon, he ſhall be preſſed with the Authority of the Scripture in this behalf; for the Apoſtle,* Rom. 11. 36. *ſaith, That* of him, *(God)* and by him, and for him are all things. *This being ſo, go they not about to deprive us of our Underſtanding, and that in a thing of the greateſt importance, even the knowledg of God himſelf, who bear us in hand that the other two Perſons beſides the Father are alſo the moſt High God, when the very Appellations that are given to them, do (as we formerly hinted) clearly intimate that they have their Being from the Father, and ſo are cauſed by him? But can they be the firſt Cauſe of all things, who have themſelves been cauſed by another? or, are not they cauſed by another, who are begotten from him?*

Fifthly; This Error is the main Stumbling-block that keepeth the ancient People of God, the Jews, from entring into the Church of Chriſt, inaſmuch as they conceive it to be the genuine Doctrine of the Chriſtian Religion it ſelf. For they having formerly ſmarted for their Idolatry, are now grown exceeding cautious of any Tenet looking that way. But this, as we have ſhewn before, and the Jews well enough perceive (who therefore, amongſt ſundry other things, chiefly object againſt Chriſtians the common Doctrine of the Trinity) maketh three Gods. *Wherefore, tho the Jews have been juſtly puniſhed by God with long Blindneſs and Hardneſs of Heart, for not receiving our Lord Jeſus, when he was ſent unto them; yet is it obſervable that this hath not come to paſs without the great fault of Chriſtians alſo, who quickly turning aſide from the ſtraight and eaſy way of believing in God, ſet down in the Scripture, and (according to the inbred Curioſity of Men) hunting after Obſcurities, have by the cunning of Satan loſt themſelves in the endleſs mazes of Error and Superſtition; and erecting a new* Babel, *confounded the pure and plain Language of the Holy Spirit with their* Trinunities, Coeſſentialities, Modalities, eternal Generations, eternal Proceſſions, Incarnations, Hypoſtatical Unions, *and the like monſtrous Terms, fitter for Conjurers than Chriſtians, eſpecially ſuch as profeſs to reject the Inventions of Men, and keep themſelves wholly to the Word of God.*

Sixthly; This Doctrine prohibits the Accompliſhment of that which God long ſince promiſed by the Prophet Zechariah, *Chap.* 14. 9. In that day the LORD ſhall be one, and his Name one, *(for ſo ought the words to be rendred according to the Hebrew.) And I the rather mention this, becauſe our Nation hath by ſolemn League and Covenant engaged it ſelf to promote this very thing, making uſe of the Prophet's words in the cloſe of the ſecond Article of the Covenant. Go to*

now,

now, ye that ſo much inculcate the Covenant, thundring out in your Pulpits the Judgments of God againſt the Breakers thereof; tell me whether ye of all Men are not moſt guilty of infringing it, and that in the moſt important Article thereof? Do not ye ſtifly contend that the LORD *is* three *(tho there be not ſo much as one Scripture that ſaith ſo) and accordingly call him* Deum Trinum; *and that his Name is not* one, *but* three, *even the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit? And am not I, who on the contrary maintain that the* LORD *is* one, *not* three, *and to that purpoſe alledg moſt expreſs Scriptures, as namely that,* Mark 12. 29. Hearken, O Iſrael, the LORD our God, the Lord is one *(for ſo ſhould the place be rendred, both becauſe the word* one *is in the Greek ſet after the word* LORD, *and alſo becauſe the Hebrew word* Jehovah, *for which* LORD *is here put, being a proper Name, cannot have the word* one *conſtrued before it;) and that his Name is* one, *even the Father, as innumerable places of the Scripture teſtify. For how often doth the very Apoſtle* Paul *wiſh Grace and Peace from* God the Father? *and where doth either he or any other ſacred Writer, uſe ſuch an Expreſſion as that of* God the Son, *or* God the Holy Spirit? *Am not I, I ſay, the Object of your Hatred for doing thus, and ſo in effect for keeping the Covenant? and do ye not therefore go about to kill me? Ceaſe therefore any longer to cry,* The Covenant, The Covenant, *unleſs ye keep cloſer to the ſcope thereof, and uſing all diligence, enquire after the true God, who he is, and how he muſt be worſhipped? To further which Enquiry, or rather to lead you directly to the knowledg of the thing it ſelf, I have here preſented you with a Confeſſion of Faith touching the holy Trinity, exactly drawn out of the Scriptures, with the Texts alledged at large, that ſo you may the better judg how ſuitable the ſame is to the Word of God. Neither have I other aim in the Publication thereof, than to reſtore that pure and genuine Knowledg of God delivered in the Scripture, and which hath for many hundred Years been hidden from the Eyes of Men by the corrupt Gloſſes and Traditions of Antichriſt, who hath inſtead thereof obtruded upon them I know not what abſurd and uncouth Notions, bearing them in hand that Ignorance is the Mother of Devotion, and that they then think and ſpeak beſt of God, when their Conceits and Words are moſt irrational and ſenſleſs. By which means, having renounced thoſe Quiddities and ſtrange Terms that have vitiated the ſimplicity of the Scripture, and having laid aſleep the Contentions ariſing from them, we ſhall at length unanimouſly with one Mouth glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* Amen.

JOHN BIDDLE.

A CONFESSION of FAITH Touching the Holy Trinity, According to the SCRIPTURE.

Article I.

I Believe, That there is one moſt High God, Creator of Heaven and Earth, and firſt Cauſe of all things pertaining to our Salvation, and conſequently the ultimate Object of our Faith and Worſhip; and that this God is none but the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the firſt Perſon of the HOLY TRINITY.

Joh. 17. 3. *This is Eternal Life, that they know thee* (Father) *the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.* Obſerve here in the Firſt Place, that our Saviour Chriſt, ſetting down thoſe Perſons, in the knowledg of whom eternal Life conſiſteth, makes no mention of the Holy Spirit; whereas, if he were God, the knowledg of him would be as neceſſary for the attainment of Eternal Life as that of the Father. Secondly, He ſo deſcribeth the Father, as that he makes him the only true God, thereby manifeſtly excluding any other Perſon whatſoever from being the true God. Thirdly, as for himſelf, he doth not ſay that it is Eternal Life to know him as eternally begotten, and co-eſſential to the Father, (both which are contradictious in themſelves, and un-heard of in the Scripture) but only as ſent by the Father, and conſequently ſuch a one as by his Will, and in his Name manageth the buſineſs of our Salvation. 1 Cor. 8. 5, 6. *Though there be that are called Gods, whether in Heaven, or on Earth, as there are many Gods, and many Lords; yet to us there is but one God, even the Father, of whom are all things, and we to him; and one Lord, even Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we through him.* In this Paſſage Chriſt is in expreſs terms excluded from being that one God of Chriſti-

ans, and the Holy Spirit in general terms excluded from being that one God, or that one Lord; wherefore if we give ſuch credence to the Apoſtle as we ought, and had not rather hearken to *Athanaſius* than to *Paul*, we will with *Paul* confeſs, that that one God of Chriſtians is no other than the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, Eph. 4. 4, 5, 6. *There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye have been called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and among all, and in you all.* Which Paſſage of the ſame Apoſtle clearly intimates the different Nature, Order, and Dignity of the three Perſons of the *HOLY TRINITY*, and was written for that very end: For when he ſaith, that there is one Spirit, he muſt mean either one *created*, or one *uncreated* Spirit, ſince (whatſoever ſome talk to the contrary) no other kind of Spirit is conceiveable: Not one *uncreated* Spirit, for ſo there will be another *uncreated* Spirit beſides God (which is abſurd) ſince this Spirit here is plainly and purpoſely diſtinguiſhed from God; wherefore he meaneth one *created* Spirit: But if ſo, then there is ſimply one *created* Spirit, or one *created* Spirit by way of excellency only; not ſimply one *created* Spirit, for the Scripture elſewhere mentions ſeven Spirits of God attending on him, *Rev.* 1. 4. which *Beza*, *Druſius* and *Mede* confeſs to be meant of ſeven principal Angels; and the Divine Author to the *Hebrews* ſaith of the Angels in general, *That they are all miniſtring Spirits*, and conſequently *created* Spirits. It remaineth therefore that there is one *created* Spirit by way of excellency only, which is the Holy Spirit. In like manner, when the Apoſtle ſaith, there is one Lord, he muſt mean either one *made*, or one *un-made* Lord, ſince by the confeſſion of all, there is no Medium: not one *un-made* Lord, for then there will be another *un-made* Lord beſides God (which is abſurd) ſince this Lord is alſo here plainly and purpoſely diſtinguiſhed from God; wherefore he meaneth one *made* Lord: But if ſo, then there is either ſimply one *made* Lord, or elſe one *made* Lord by way of Excellency only; not ſimply one *made* Lord, for ſo there are many Lords, as not only the Apoſtle, but Experience it ſelf teſtifieth. It remaineth therefore that there is one *made* Lord by way of Excellency only, which is Jeſus of *Nazareth*, who after he had been crucified by the *Jews*, was raiſed up from the Dead, and exalted to the right Hand of God, and by him made Lord and Chriſt; as *Peter* in the beginning of the Goſpel, when the Holy Spirit was fallen on him, plainly teſtifies, *Acts* 2. 22, 23, 33, 36. Wherefore ſince neither the Holy Spirit is an *uncreated* Spirit, nor the Lord Jeſus an *unmade* Lord, neither of them, but the Father only is God (I mean, with the Apoſtle *Paul* himſelf, God by way of Excellency; for otherwiſe he confeſſeth that there are many Gods, 1 *Cor.* 8. 5.) Mat. 24. 36. *But of that Day, and that Hour knoweth none, no not the Angels in Heaven, but my Father only.* If the Father only ſometimes knew the Day of Judgment, then neither the Son (who, take him how you will, is not the Father, and therefore openly confeſſeth himſelf to be ignorant of it, *Mark* 13. 32.) nor the Holy Spirit knew it, and conſequently neither of them is the moſt High God; ſince he doth, and ever did know all things. Rom. 15. 6. *That ye may with one Mind, and one Mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* James 3. 9. *Therewith bleſs we God, even the Father: and therewith curſe we Men, who were made after the likeneſs of God.* John 6. 27. *Labour not for the Meat that periſheth, but for that Meat which endureth to Eternal Life, which the Son of Man ſhall give to you: for him hath the Father ſealed, the God,* (ſo the Original hath it.) In theſe three Paſſages, God (that is, by the confeſſion of all, the moſt high God) is by the Scripture it ſelf interpreted the Father, and therefore none but he can be God. John 8. 54. *Jeſus anſwered, If I honour my ſelf, my Honour is nothing: it is my Father that honoureth me, whom ye ſay that he is your God.*

You ſee here who was the God that the Jews worſhip'd, namely the Father; and herein there is no difference between them and Chriſtians, ſince the Apoſtle *Paul* teſtifieth,

ſieth, 2 *Tim.* 1. 3. *That he ſerved God from his Fore-fathers*; that is, the ſame God which he had received from the Jews his Fore-fathers. See alſo *Acts* 3. 13. and *chap.* 5. 30, 31. and *chap.* 22. 14. In which three places the Father is called *the God of* Abraham, *the God of* Iſaac, *and the God of* Jacob; and by that Appellation diſtinguiſhed from the Son; which could not be, if the Son were the ſame God with the Father, ſince common things do not diſtinguiſh, but ſuch as are proper: But if the Son be not the ſame God with the Father, much leſs the Holy Spirit, ſince the Scripture abundantly witneſſeth that he is ſent and diſpoſed of by the Son. Neh. 9. 6. *Thou, even thou art* LORD *alone; thou haſt made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens, with all their Hoſt, the Earth, and all Things therein.* Obſerve here that the *Levites* do not ſay, *Ye, even ye are Lord*, but *Thou, even thou art Lord alone*; intimating that one Perſon only is the moſt high God, for the word [*Thou*] denoteth a ſingle Perſon: And this is the perpetual Doctrine of the whole Scripture. But if one Perſon only be the moſt High God, this Perſon muſt of neceſſity be the Father, ſince he, by the confeſſion of all ſides, is the moſt High God. Neither doth that paſſage, *Gen.* 1. 26. wherein God ſaith, *Let us make Man*, any whit contradict this Truth. For doth it follow from thence that there are ſeveral Perſons in God? Might I not by the ſame kind of arguing conclude, that becauſe Chriſt, *Mark* 4. 30. ſaith, *Whereunto ſhall we liken the Kingdom of God, and with what compariſon ſhall we compare it?* and John 3. 11. *Verily, verily I ſay unto thee, We ſpeak what we know, and teſtify what we have ſeen, and ye receive not our Teſtimony*: therefore there are ſeveral Perſons in Chriſt? And alſo, becauſe *Paul*, 2 Cor. 10. 1, 2. ſaith, *Now I* Paul *my ſelf beſeech you, by the meekneſs and gentleneſs of Chriſt, who in preſence am baſe among you, but being abſent am bold toward you: I ſay, I beſeech you, that I may not be bold when I am preſent, with that confidence wherewith I think to be bold againſt ſome, who think of us, as if we walked according to the Fleſh*: therefore there are ſeveral Perſons in *Paul*? The utmoſt that can be concluded from this paſſage of *Genteſis*, is, That there was ſome other Perſon with God, whom he employed in the Creation, as of other Things, ſo of Man. Which Perſon had been before mentioned by *Moſes*, verſe 2. where he ſaith, *The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the Waters.* Thus it is ſaid of the Lord, Pſal. 104. 30. *Thou ſendeſt forth thy Spirit, they are created: and thou renewеſt the face of the Earth*: and Job 26. 13. *By his Spirit he hath garniſhed the Heavens; his Hand hath formed the crooked Serpent.* Obſerve by the way, that theſe Scriptures plainly intimate that the Spirit was but the Inſtrument of God in creating Things, ſince God is ſaid to have garniſhed the Heavens *by him*, and *that he was ſent by God* to that purpoſe, and ſo miniſtred unto him. Moreover, the wiſe *Elihu* ſaith, Job 33. 4. *The Spirit of God hath made me, and the Breath of the Almighty hath given me Life.* Which plainly ſheweth that the Spirit had a hand in creating Man. It was the Spirit therefore, and he only, to whom God ſaid, *Let us make Man.* For had the Son of God, Chriſt Jeſus, been alſo imployed in creating *Adam*, would not he likewiſe have been mentioned in the Hiſtory of the Creation? was it not as material, and altogether of as great conſequence for *Moſes* and the *Jews* to have known, that the Son of God, Chriſt Jeſus, was employed by God in creating *Adam*, as the Holy Spirit? But it is well that the Holy Scripture, whilſt it attributeth Creation unto Chriſt, doth, what by the Nature of the Thing it ſelf, what by the Circumſtances of the Places, what by expreſs Words, ſignify that it is meant not of the firſt and old Creation, but of the ſecond and new, conſiſting in the reduction of Things to a new State, Condition, or Order. Otherwiſe, had he at firſt created *Adam*, how could he himſelf ſay, Mat. 19. 4. *And he* (Jeſus) *anſwered and ſaid unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them* (Adam *and* Eve) *at the Beginning, made them Male and Female?* Is not that Deſcription, *He that made them*, &c. made uſe of to diſtinguiſh God from Chriſt? And doth not Chriſt here take it for granted,

together with the *Phariſees*, that not himſelf, but another created Man? Again, how could *Peter* ſay, 1 Epiſt. 1. 20. Who (Chriſt) *verily was fore-ordained*, (Gr. *fore-known*) *before the Foundation of the World*. Had Chriſt then had a Being? Are not thoſe things only foreknown, that are to come, and not already in being? Thirdly, How could *Paul*, Rom. 5. 14. ſay, *After the ſimilitude of* Adam's *Tranſgreſſion, who is the Figure* (or, *Type*) *of him that was to come*, (or, *that was to be*, as the Gr. Expreſſion ὁ τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος doth ſignify:) had Chriſt then not only had a Being, but created *Adam?* was *Adam* a Type of him that created him? was he that created *Adam*, as yet to be? can it be ſaid of any one, *that he is to be*, whoſe Perſon doth already exiſt?

This which we have ſpoken of the Holy Spirit, that he was preſent at the Creation of the World, and is included when God ſaid, *Let Us make Man*, doth clear thoſe other Paſſages of the Scripture, where the like Expreſſion is uſed; as Gen. 3. 22. *And the Lord God ſaid, Behold, the Man is become as one of Us, to know good and evil.* Gen. 11. 6, 7. *And the Lord ſaid, Behold, the People is one, and they have all one Language: and this they begin to do, and now nothing will be reſtrained from them, which they have imagined to do. Go to, let Us go down, and there confound their Language, that they may not underſtand one anothers Speech.* Iſa. 6. 8. *Alſo I heard the Voice of the Lord, ſaying, Whom ſhall I ſend, and who will go for Us?* For it ought ſutably to be underſtood, that by *Us* in all theſe places, is meant the Lord with his Spirit; ſeeing the Spirit is elſewhere called *the Spirit of Knowledge*, Iſa. 11. 2. and ſaid to give *diverſity of Tongues*, 1 Cor. 12. 10, 11. Acts 2. 4. and *Iſaiah* himſelf teſtifieth, *That both the Lord and his Spirit had ſent him*, chap. 48. 16. It is alſo eaſy to conceive that by Wiſdom, *Prov. 8.* is meant the Spirit of Wiſdom; for ſo is the Holy Spirit denominated by *Iſaiah*, chap. 11. 2. and whoſoever ſhall exactly conſider what is ſpoken of the Holy Spirit in this paſſage of *Iaiah*, and in the Hiſtory of the Creation, and elſewhere in the Scripture, and compare it with what is ſpoken of Wiſdom, *Prov. 8.* eſpecially if he further add what is more ampiy declared in the 7, 8, and 9, chapters of the Wiſdom of *Solomon*, and in the firſt and 24th chapters of *Siracides*, will perceive that as by Wiſdom is meant a moſt excellent Creature, ſo that Creature is the Holy Spirit.

Finally, This intimateth to us, why the ſaid *Elihu*, *Job* 35. 10. ſpeaketh on this wiſe, *But none ſaith, Where is God my Maker*, (Heb. *Makers*) *who giveth Songs in the Night?* The word *Makers* implyeth that more than one Perſon made Man, though in a different Order of Cauſality. But inaſmuch as God is ſaid to be the *Makers*, this intimateth that whatſoever Power of making was in any other Parſon employed in that Work, it proceeded from God; ſo that upon the matter God was the Makers.

Article II.

I Believe, That there is one chief Son of the moſt High God, or Spiritual, Heavenly, and perpetual Lord and King, ſet over the Church by God, and ſecond Cauſe of all Things pertaining to our Salvation, and conſequently, the intermediate Object of our Faith and Worſhip: and this Son of the moſt High God is none but Jeſus Chriſt, the ſecond Perſon of the HOLY TRINITY.

Luke 1. 32. *He* (Jeſus) *ſhall be great, and ſhall be called the Son of the moſt High.* Where note, that the Son is not equal to the Father, as the very Son himſelf openly profeſſeth, *John.* 14. 28. where making a compariſon, not between any Nature of his that was not a Perſon, but between his own very Perſon, and that of the Father, he ſaith expreſly, *My Father is greater than I.* Note, I ſay, that the Son is not equal to the Father; otherwiſe the Epithet of *Moſt High* could

not

not be appropriated to the Father, and put to diſtinguiſh him from the Son, (as neither could it afterwards, ver. 35. be made uſe of to diſtinguiſh Him from the Holy Spirit, if the Holy Spirit were equal to the Father) for how can an Expreſſion a-like common to twain, be apt to diſtinguiſh one from the other? How is the Father, and that contradiſtinctly to the Son, *the Moſt High*, if the Son be *as high* as He? Though ſome from that miſtaken Text, *Phil.* 2. 5, 6, 7, 8. would inſer the contrary, and ſo contradict the expreſs words of Chriſt himſelf. Whereas, if the place be rightly conſidered, it maketh againſt them; the Words and Senſe being thus: *Let this Mind be in you, which was alſo in Chriſt Jeſus; who being in the form of God,* (for the exerciſe and demonſtration of Divine Power, whereby he wrought Miracles in as free and uncontrolled a manner, as if God himſelf had been on the Earth) *thought it not Robbery* (or, *a Prey*) *to be equal with God:* (that is, did not eſteem this Equality of his with God, conſiſting in the free exerciſe of Divine Power, to be a Prey, by holding it faſt, and refuſing to let it go, as Robbers are wont to do when they have got a Prey, or Booty: *but* (Gr.) *emptied himſelf,* (in making no uſe of the Divine Power within him, to reſcue himſelf out of the Hands of the Officers ſent to apprehend him) *and took upon him the form of a Servant,* (in ſuffering himſelf to be apprehended, bound, and whipt, as Servants are wont to be) *being made in the likeneſs of Men,* (that is, ordinary and vulgar Men, who are endued with no Divine Power.) *And being found in faſhion,* (or, *habit*) *as a Man,* (that is, in his outward Quality, Condition, and acting no whit differing from a common Man,) *He humbled himſelf, and became obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Croſs.* Now that this place doth not ſpeak of an *Incarnation*, or *Aſſumption of Humane Nature*, (as they term it) nor of ſuch an *Equality* as is commonly conceived, is evident from all the Circumſtances. For firſt, The Scope of the Apoſtle is to exhort the *Philippians* to Humility, and that they would do nothing out of vain-glory. To which purpoſe, he ſetteth before them the Example of Chriſt Jeſus. And therefore the Act of Chriſt which he doth exemplify, muſt be manifeſt. Since Examples are won't to be taken only from ſuch things as are manifeſt. But to whom was or could that Incarnation, which Chriſtians commonly talk of, be manifeſt, when they themſelves ſay it paſſeth the underſtanding of Angels to comprehend it? Yea, that there was any Incarnation at all made, the Scripture nowhere expreſly affirmeth, nor can it be ſo much as proved by any good Conſequence from thence, as ſeveral Learned Men have ſhewn. Secondly, The Apoſtle ſpeaketh of our Lord as a Man, in that he giveth him the Titles of *Chriſt Jeſus*, both which agree to him only as a Man. For he is called Jeſus, as he was a Child conceived of the Holy Spirit in the Virgin's Womb, and brought forth by her, *Luke* 1. 27, 30, 31, 35. and Chriſt ſignifieth the Anointed, *John* 1. 41. and accordingly Jeſus is expreſly called the Chriſt of God, *Luke* 9. 20. but he was Anointed (as the Adverſaries themſelves will confeſs) as a Man, and not as God. See *Acts* 10. 38. Thirdly, He doth not ſay, *That the Son thought it not Robbery to be equal with the Father*, which Words would indeed have plainly thwarted thoſe formerly cited out of the 14th of *John*: but *that Chriſt Jeſus thought it not Robbery*, or *a Prey, to be equal with God.* Which cannot be in reſpect of Eſſence; for he muſt either have the ſame Eſſence in number, or a different one. Not the ſame Eſſence in number, for then he will not be equal with God in Eſſence, but the ſame; for Equality muſt be in reſpect of two things different at leaſt in number, otherwiſe it will not be Equality, but Identity. Thus he that is equal to another in ſtature, muſt not have the ſame ſtature in number with the other, but different in number, though the ſame in kind. But the Adverſaries hold that the Father and the Son have the ſame Eſſence in number, not in ſpecies or kind. If Chriſt hath an Eſſence different in number from that of God, it muſt needs alſo be inferiour thereunto, there

there being no Eſſence equal to his, as every one will confeſs. Wherefore the Equality aforeſaid cannot be in reſpect of Eſſence, but of ſomething elſe. But let it conſiſt in whatſoever you will, it muſt either be ſimple and abſolute, or elſe only in part (ſince *Ariſtotle*, according to the common Notion of Men, acknowledgeth in his *Categories*, that Equality admitteth more and leſs.) Not ſimple and abſolute, for then God would not be *the moſt High*, ſince he is not *the moſt High*, who hath another ſimply and abſolutely equal with him. Beſides, That Deſcription would be ſuperfluous, which the Apoſtle uſeth, ſaying, *Who being in the form of God*; for if this Deſcription be, (as indeed it ought to be, and is) pertinent to the thing in hand, it intimateth that this Equality of Chriſt with God is to be extended no farther, than as he was in the form of God. But the form of a thing, (as appeareth from the common Acceptation of the Word, and from that following Clauſe, *He took upon him the form of a Servant*; and alſo from thoſe words, *Mark* 16. 12. *After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the Country:*) is ſomething viſible and outwardly apparent, ſuch as is neither the Eſſence, nor Power of any thing, but only the exerciſe and demonſtration of Power. In the exerciſe therefore and demonſtration of Divine Power, whereby he did Miracles, was Chriſt in the form of God, and equal to God, as the Apoſtle *John* explaineth it, chap. 5. 18. ſaying, *Therefore the Jews ſought the more to kill him, becauſe he not only had broken the Sabbath, but ſaid alſo, that God was his Father, making himſelf equal with God.* Which is not ſo to be underſtood, as if Chriſt by calling God his Father, made himſelf equal with God, (for who ſeeth not the manifeſt Abſurdity hereof, ſince the very Appellation of Father implyeth a Prerogative above the Son, as Chriſt himſelf acknowledgeth in the fore-quoted 14th of *John*) in that the Son, as he is the Son, is beholden to the Father for his Being? Again, the Words would then have run thus, *thereby making himſelf equal with God,* not ſimply, *making himſelf equal with God:* but becauſe by uttering thoſe words, ver. 17. *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work*, he did both ſay that God was his Father, and in working made himſelf equal with God. Furthermore, had Chriſt been ſimply and abſolutely equal with God, how could he be exceedingly exalted by God, ſince by this reckoning he would become higher than God himſelf? which is not only abſurd, but blaſphemous to imagine. In the fourth place, Had the Apoſtle here ſpoken of an Aſſumption of the Humane Nature, he would not have ſaid, *That Chriſt became in the likeneſs of Men*, and *was found in faſhion as a Man:* for if Men (as the Adverſaries muſt hold, when they alledge this Place to prove that Chriſt aſſumed a Humane Nature, and became Man) be here conſidered according to their Eſſence and Nature, this would imply that Chriſt had not the Eſſence, and Nature, but only the likeneſs and faſhion of a Man, and ſo was not a true and real Man. By Men therefore are here meant vulgar and ordinary Men, for ſo this word is elſewhere taken in the Scriptures, as *Pſal.* 82. 6. *I have ſaid, ye are Gods: and all of you are Children of the moſt High. But ye ſhall die like Men, and fall like one of the Princes.* And Judg. 16. 7. *Then ſhall I be weak, and be as one of Men* (ſo the Hebrew, *ekadh haadam*, ſignifieth.) See alſo ver. 11. of the ſame chap. Fifthly, When it is ſaid, *But emptied himſelf*, (or, as our Engliſh Tranſlation hath it, *Made himſelf of no Reputation*) this implieth, that if Chriſt had not emptied himſelf of that Divine Form, he had thought it a Prey to be equal with God. Which cannot without the implication of a Contradiction, or, what is worſe, of Blaſphemy, be affirmed of God. But Chriſt had thought it Robbery, or a Prey, to have been equal with God in doing Miracles, if he had not laid aſide the exerciſe and demonſtration of his Divine Power, and fallen into the Hands of his Adverſaries, as a weak and vulgar Man. For unleſs he had done ſo, he had diſobeyed the Commandment of God, and conſequently thought his Divine Form

to

to be a Prey, not a Gift of God; and that it was to be kept on for his own Glory, not put off for the Glory of God.

It is therefore evident by what hath been ſaid, that this Place hindereth not, but that we ought to believe that Chriſt Jeſus is ſimply inferiour to God, and ſo not God. And indeed, I can never ſufficiently wonder at the ſtupidity of Men, who becauſe the Apoſtle ſaith, *That Chriſt Jeſus thought it not Robbery to be equal with God*, conclude that therefore he is God. For is it poſſible for any one to be equal with himſelf? Muſt not he that is equal with any one, be ſuppoſed not to be he with whom he is equal? But let us now proceed to other Scriptures. 1 Cor. 8. 6. *To us there is but one Lord, even Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we through him.* By *all things* are not here meant all things ſimply, but all things pertaining to our Salvation, as is evident both in that he ſpeaketh of Chriſtians, and alſo putteth an Article before the Word [*All*] in the Gr. which implyeth a Reſtriction. Acts 2. 39. *Let all the Houſe of Iſrael know aſſuredly, that God hath made this ſame Jeſus, whom ye have crucified, Lord and Chriſt.* Phil. 2. 9, 10. *He* (Jeſus) *humbled himſelf, and became obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Croſs: Wherefore God hath alſo highly exalted him, and given him a Name that is above every Name, that in the Name of Jeſus every Knee ſhould bow, of things in Heaven, and things on Earth, and things under the Earth; and that every Tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.* 1 Pet. 1. 21. *Who through him* (Jeſus) *believe in God that raiſed him from the Dead, and gave him Glory, ſo that your Faith and Hope is in God.* Joh. 12. 44. *He that believeth in me* (Jeſus) *believeth not in me, but in him that ſent me.* Rom. 1. 8. *I thank my God, through Jeſus Chriſt, that your Faith is ſpoken of through the whole World.* Rom. 16. 27. *To the only wiſe God, through Jeſus Chriſt, be Glory for ever.* Theſe five places laſt quoted, ſhew, that the Glory and Thanks that we give to Chriſt, and the Faith and Hope that we place in him, do not reſt in him, but through him tend to God the Father; and conſequently, that the Son is not equal to the Father, but ſubordinate to him. 1 Cor. 15. 24, 25, 28. *Then cometh the end, when he* (Chriſt) *ſhall have delivered up the Kingdom to God even the Father* (Gr. *to the God and Father*) *when he ſhall have put down all Rule, and all Authority and Power,* (or *Force.*) *For he muſt reign till he hath put all the Enemies under his Feet. And when all things ſhall be ſubdued unto him, then ſhall the Son alſo himſelf be ſubject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be All in All.* It is here ſaid, that Chriſt ſhall reign till he hath put all the Enemies under his Feet; which done, he ſhall deliver the Kingdom up to God the Father, and become ſubject unto him. But how could theſe things come to paſs, if Chriſt were the *moſt High God?* Certainly by ſo doing, Chriſt would ceaſe to be the *moſt High God*; for, without Controverſy, he to whom any one becometh ſubject, is higher than he that becometh ſubject. Neither let the Adverſaries ſay, that this is ſpoken of Chriſt according to his Human Nature only. For (to omit that this goodly Diſtinction is no-where to be found in God's Word) Firſt, This is to take for granted that Chriſt hath more than one Nature, and ſo to beg the Queſtion; whereas it is a ſign of a deſperate Cauſe, not to be able to anſwer Objections without taking for granted what is in Controverſy. Secondly, The Apoſtle here ſpeaketh of Chriſt as a Perſon, in that he ſpeaketh of him as reigning, ſince none can be a King and reign, but a Perſon, and that as a Perſon, all Offices being proper to Perſons; wherefore they muſt grant, either that the Perſon of Chriſt, which they hold to be a Perſon of Supream Deity, delivereth up his Kingdom, and becometh ſubject; or that his Humane Nature (as they phraſe it) is a Perſon, and conſequently, left there ſhould be two Perſons in one and the ſame Subject, and ſo Chriſt not be one but two, that he hath no other Nature and Perſon. The latter of which ſubverteth the Opinion of the Adverſaries; the firſt alſo it ſelf. Thirdly, It is worth the obſerving that the Apoſtle ſaith, *Then ſhall alſo the Son himſelf*

be

be ſubject. But how can the Son himſelf become ſubject, if only a Human Nature added to the Son, and not the very Perſon of the Son is ſubjected? Certainly this Place (which is ſo full and clear, that ſundry being convinced by the evidence thereof, have abandoned the common groſs Opinion of two Natures in Chriſt) ſeemeth purpoſely fitted by God to ſtop their Mouths, who ſhould go about to elude what is here ſpoken to ſhew the ſubordination and inferiority of Chriſt to the Father, by ſaying that the Son ſhall be ſubject according to the Human Nature only: for the Apoſtle moſt emphatically ſaith, *That the Son alſo himſelf ſhall be ſubject*; ſo that if there be any Nature in him better than other, according to which he chiefly is the Son of God, even according to that ſhall he become ſubject. *Rom.* 10. 9. *If thou ſhalt confeſs with thy Mouth, that Jeſus is Lord,* (ſo the Original hath it, as will further appear by comparing this Place with *Phil.* 2. 10.) *and ſhalt believe with thy Heart that God hath raiſed him from the Dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved.* The Apoſtle here ſets down a brief Symbol of the Chriſtian Religion, declaring what is to be both believed with the Heart, and confeſſed with the Mouth, concerning the Dignity of Chriſt; and which if we believe and confeſs, we ſhall obtain Salvation. But how could it be, that if Chriſt were the moſt High God, the ſame with the Father, and had raiſed himſelf from the Dead, and that by his own Power, the Apoſtle ſhould here affirm, *That if we only confeſs with the Mouth, that Jeſus is Lord, and believe with the Heart* (not that he raiſed himſelf, but) *that God raiſed him from the Dead, we ſhall be ſaved?* Certain I am, that *Athanaſius* in his Creed is far more peremptory; for he ſaith, That unleſs a Man believe that Chriſt is of one and the ſame Eſſence, and conſequently one and the ſame God with the Father, he cannot be ſaved; whereas the Apoſtle, ſpeaking of that Faith which is neceſſary to Salvation, intimateth it to be ſufficient if we believe that Jeſus is Lord. Now whether *Paul* or *Athanaſius* be rather to be credited, I leave it to all Chriſtians to judg. The like may be ſaid of that Paſſage, *Rom.* 4. 22, 23, 24. and that *John* 17. 3. which we alſo alledged on the former Article; Eph. 4. 4, 5, 6. *There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye have been called in one Hope of your Calling; one Lord, one Faith, &c.*

ARTICLE III.

I Believe, That Jeſus Chriſt, to the intent he might be our Brother, and have a Fellow-feeling of our Infirmities, and ſo become the more ready to help us, (the conſideration whereof, is the greateſt Encouragement to Piety that can be imagined) hath no other than a Human Nature, and therefore in this very Nature is not only a Perſon (ſince none but a Human Perſon can be our Brother) but alſo our Lord, yea our God.

2 Tim. 2. 5. *There is one God, and one Mediator of God and Men, the Man Chriſt Jeſus.* John 3. 13. *And no Man hath aſcended up to Heaven, but he that deſcended from Heaven, the Son of Man, which is in Heaven,* or rather, *which was in Heaven,* as the Participle ὢν in the Greek, not only may (in that it is of the Preterimperfect as well as of the Preſent Tenſe) but muſt here be rendred, otherwiſe theſe Words will contradict thoſe immediately going before: for how could Chriſt ſtill be in Heaven, after he had deſcended from thence? Again, he would as a Man (for he here ſtileth himſelf the Son of Man) be in Heaven and on the Earth at the ſame time, which is confeſſed to be falſe. John 6. 62. *What if ye ſhall ſee the Son of Man aſcend up where he was before* (or, *had been before?*) John 8. 40. *But now ye ſeek to kill me, a Man who have told you the Truth, which I have heard from God.* John 3. 14, 15. *And as* Moſes *lifted up the Serpent in the Wilderneſs, even ſo muſt the Son of Man be lifted up: That whoſoever believeth on him, may not periſh, but have eternal Life.* Mat. 9. 6, 7, 8. *But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on Earth to forgive Sins,* (then he ſpeaketh to the ſick of the Palſy) *Ariſe, take up thy Bed, and go unto thine Houſe. And he aroſe, and departed to his Houſe.*

But

But when the Multitudes ſaw it, they marvelled, and glorified God, which had given ſuch Power to Men. John 5. 22,23. *The Father judgeth none, but hath given all Judgment to the Son: that all ſhould honour the Son, even as they honour the Father:* and ver. 7. *And (the Father) hath given him (the Son) Authority to execute Judgment alſo, becauſe he is the Son of Man.* Mark 2.28. *Therefore the Son of Man is Lord alſo of the Sabbath.* 1 Cor. 15.21,22. *For ſince by Man came Death, by Man came alſo the Reſurrection of the Dead: For as in* Adam (or, *by* Adam) *all dye, even ſo in Chriſt* (or, *by Chriſt*) *ſhall all be made alive:* and verſ. 45,47. *The firſt Man* Adam *was made a Living Soul, the laſt* Adam *a quickning Spirit. The firſt Man is from the Earth, earthly* (or, *duſty:*) *the ſecond Man is the Lord from Heaven.* Mat. 24. 30, 31. *And they ſhall ſee the Son of Man come in the Clouds of Heaven, with Power and great Glory. And he ſhall ſend his Angels with a Trumpet of great ſound, and they ſhall gather together his Elect from the four Winds, from one end of Heaven to the other.* Mat. 16. 27, 28. *The Son of Man ſhall come in the Glory of his Father, with his Angels; and then ſhall he reward every Man according to his doing. Verily I ſay unto you, There be ſome ſtanding here, who ſhall not taſte of Death, till they ſee the Son of Man come in his Kingdom.* Dan. 7. 13, 14. *I ſaw in the Night Viſions, and behold, one like the Son of Man, came with the Clouds of Heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him* (Heb. they offered him before him.) *And there was given him Dominion, and Glory, and a Kingdom, that all People, Nations, and Languages ſhould ſerve him: his Dominion is an everlaſting Dominion, which ſhall not paſs away; and his Kingdom that which ſhall not be deſtroyed.* Obſerve now in the firſt place, that the moſt excellent things that are in the Scripture attributed to Chriſt, are attributed to him not only under the Notion, but alſo under the very Name of a Man; *as to be a Mediator; to have aſcended and been in Heaven before his Death and Reſurrection; to have heard the truth from God; to be believed on unto eternal Life; to forgive Sins; to have all Judgment, and therefore to be honoured as the Father; to be Lord of the Sabbath; to be the Author of the Reſurrection; to be a quickning Spirit; to be the Lord from Heaven; to ſend his Angels, and gather his Elect; to come in his Kingdom, and render a reward to every Man according to his doing; to have an everlaſting Dominion given to him, that all Nations may ſerve him.* Why then ſhould we imagine another Nature in him, beſides his Human, to ſuſtain his great Dignity? Obſerve alſo, that the Scripture in the aforeſaid Quotations, whilſt it calleth Chriſt a Man, ſpeaketh of him as a Perſon, in that it ſpeaketh of him as a Mediator, Ambaſſador, Saviour, Lord, Judg, or King, all which are the Names of Perſons; all Actions and Offices belonging to Perſons only, as ſuch. Wherefore Chriſt according to his Human Nature is a Perſon, and conſequently (unleſs we will abſurdly hold with *Neſtorius*, that he hath two Perſons) cannot be a Perſon in the Divine Nature. Deut. 18. 15. *The Lord thy God will raiſe up unto thee a Prophet from the midſt of thee, of thy Brethren, like unto me: unto him ſhall ye hearken.* You ſee here that Chriſt (for this is a Prophecy concerning him, as *Peter* teſtifieth, *Act.* 3.22.) was to be a Prophet whom the Lord God of the *Iſraelites* ſhould raiſe up unto them of their Brethren, like unto *Moſes*, and therefore did not already exiſt in the time of *Moſes*, much leſs was the Lord God, unleſs any one will be ſo abſurd as to ſay, that the Lord God can raiſe up himſelf for a Prophet. Acts 2. 22, 23, 36. *Jeſus of Nazareth, a Man approved of God amongſt you, by Miracles, Signs, and Wonders, which God did by him in the midſt of you, as ye your ſelves know: Him being delivered up by the determinate Counſel and Foreknowledg of God, ye have taken, and by wicked Hands crucified and ſlain, whom God hath raiſed up from the Dead, having looſed the Bands* (or rather, *Throes*) *of Death, in that it was impoſſible he ſhould be held by it. Therefore being exalted by the right Hand of God, and having received the Promiſe of the Holy Spirit from the Father, He hath poured out this which ye now ſee and hear: Therefore let all the Houſe of Iſrael know aſſuredly, that God hath made this very Jeſus, whom ye have crucified, Lord and Chriſt.* Theſe Words of the Apoſtle *Peter* (as well as thoſe of *Paul*, *Eph.* 4. which were formerly diſcuſſed) give clear and full evidence, touch-

ing the ſeveral Nature, Order, and Dignity of the three Perſons of the *HOLY TRINITY*. For firſt, in that *Peter* here calleth Jeſus a *Man*, and ſaith, *that God wrought Miracles by him*, this ſheweth that he was not God himſelf, nor wrought Miracles by his own proper Power, which naturally reſided in him; but was only the Inſtrument of God in working them. Again, when he ſaith, *that Jeſus being exalted by the right Hand of God, and having received the Promiſe of the Holy Spirit from the Father, poured him out upon his Diſciples*; this argueth, that he gave the Holy Spirit as a Man, ſince he could neither be *exalted by God*, nor *receive the Promiſe of the Holy Spirit from the Father*, but as a Man, (for according to the ſuppoſition of the Adverſaries themſelves, the Holy Spirit proceedeth from Chriſt as he is God, as well as from the Father) and conſequently the Holy Spirit himſelf is ſo far from being God (inaſmuch as it is abſurd, yea impoſſible that God ſhould be received by Promiſe from any one) as that he is not equal to Chriſt as Man, ſince his Exaltation, becauſe he that is given and diſpoſed of by another, muſt be inferiour in Dignity to him that giveth him.

Finally, Whereas he ſaith that God hath made this very Jeſus, whom the Jews had crucified, Lord and Chriſt; this intimateth, that Jeſus, as a Man, (for neither could any other but a Man be crucified) was made Lord by God, and therefore that his Humane Nature is a Perſon, (ſince nothing but a Perſon can be made a Lord) ſo that we need not feign to our ſelves any other Nature in Chriſt, beſides his Humane Nature, to ſuſtain this Lordſhip of his; wherefore by this Paſſage it plainly appeareth, That the *TRINITY* which the Apoſtle *Peter* believed, conſiſteth of God the Father, of the Man Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, and of the Holy Spirit, the Gift of God through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. Now ſhall the Apoſtle *Peter*, having before affirmed *that Jeſus was a Man approved of God by Miracles, which God did by him*, afterwards ſay, *Let all the Houſe of* Iſrael *know aſſuredly, that God hath made him Lord and Chriſt, this Jeſus whom ye have crucified:* And ſhall I nevertheleſs be induced by I know not what forced Conſequences of Men, repugnant to Reaſon, and the ſtream of the Scriptures, in deſpight of ſo ſignal an Admonition proceeding from the infallible Inſpiration of the Holy Spirit, to believe that Chriſt, as to his Nature, is not only a Man, but that very God which did thoſe Miracles by him, and made him Lord and Chriſt? Far be it, *Iſa.* 9. 6. *Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the Government ſhall be upon his Shoulder, and his Name ſhall be called Wonderful* (by reaſon of his Exaltation, which is ſo ſtrange and wonderful, that even the greateſt part of Chriſtians cannot believe it, and therefore imagine another Nature in Chriſt, beſides his Humane Nature, as thinking a Man uncapable of ſo tranſcendent an Exaltation,) *Counſellor*, (in acquainting us with all the Counſel of God,) *a mighty God* (by reaſon of the Divine Empire over all things, both in Heaven and on Earth, conferred on him by the Father; agreeable whereunto, *Paul* called him *a God over all, bleſſed for evermore*, Rom. 9. 5.) *a Father of the Age*, (in being the Author of the Age to come, as both the Septuagint, and the old Latin Interpreter expound it; or elſe a Father of Eternity, in being the Author of Eternal Life to all that obey him. For to render the words as the Engliſh Tranſlators do, who here call Chriſt the everlaſting Father, is to confound the Perſon of the Son with that of the Father, and ſo to introduce *Sabellianiſm*,) *the Prince of Peace*. When the Prophet here ſaith, *That the Child which was to be born to us, and the Son that was to be given to us, ſhall be called a mighty God*, he ſufficiently intimateth, that Chriſt in his Humane Nature ſhould be a mighty God, ſo that we need not fancy any other Nature in him. John 20. 27, 28. *Then ſaith he* (Jeſus) *to* Thomas, *Reach hither thy Finger, and lo my Hands; and reach hither thy Hand, and thruſt it into my Side, and be not faithleſs, but believing. And* Thomas *ſaid unto him, My Lord, and my God.* Obſerve how *Thomas* here calleth that Man Jeſus, whom he ſaw and felt, his Lord, and his God;

God; but directeth not his Speech to I know not what ſecond Perſon or Subſiſtence of God, which he neither ſaw nor felt, nor indeed ever was in *rerum naturâ*. John 10. 33, 34, 35, 36. *The Jews anſwered him, ſaying, For a good Work we ſtone thee not, but for Blaſphemy, and becauſe that thou, being a Man, makeſt thy ſelf a God* (ſo it is in the Gr.) *Jeſus anſwered them, Is it not written in your Law, I ſaid, Ye are Gods? If he called them Gods unto whom the Word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken: Say ye of him, whom the Father hath ſanctified, and ſent into the World, Thou blaſphemeſt, becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God?* Had Chriſt been endued with a Divine Nature, beſides his Humane, and did his Godhead conſiſt therein (as the Adverſaries affirm) it would have been neceſſary, for anſwering the *Jews*, here to have declared it. They objected unto Chriſt the Crime of Blaſphemy, *for that he being a Man, made himſelf a God*; doth he therefore, to decline the Imputation of Blaſphemy, reſort to an eternal Generation, or Hypoſtatical Union of Natures, ſaying, *If he call them Gods, to whom the Word of God came, ſay ye of him, whom the Father eternally begot out of his Subſtance, ſo that he is very God of very God, coeſſential, coeternal, coequal with the Father, and in whom the Humane Nature is Hypoſtatically united to the Divine, Thou blaſphemeſt, becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God?* Nothing leſs. But on the contrary, He ſheweth that he is therefore the Son of God, and conſequently a God, becauſe the Father had ſanctified him and ſent him into the World, and ſo not for having the Divine Nature united to the Humane, but for the Sanctification of the Father: Mat. 1. 20. *Joſeph thou Son of* David, *fear not to take unto thee* Mary *thy Wife: for that which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Spirit.* Had Chriſt had a Divine Nature in being the Eternal Son of God, the Angel would not have told *Joſeph*, that what was conceived in the Womb of his Wife, was of the Holy Spirit, otherwiſe not only the Humane Nature of the Eternal Son of God, but the very Eternal Son himſelf, (for the Adverſaries hold that he was conceived and born of the Virgin *Mary*,) would be of the Holy Spirit, and ſo Chriſt not only as Man, but alſo as the Eternal Son of God, be cauſed by the Holy Spirit. The latter of which (though flowing from their Opinion touching the Nature and Conception of Chriſt,) is yet denied by the Adverſaries; and ſo ſhould the former too, ſince he that was the Eternal Son of God, co-eſſential with the Father, if he would be incarnated, needed not the aſſiſtance of the Holy Spirit to furniſh him with a Humane Nature from a Virgin, being himſelf able to produce it of her, unleſs you will ſay that his own Divine Nature was in the mean time idle.

This Conſideration is ſo forcible, that *Juſtin Martyr*, preſſed with the difficulty thereof, ſaith in his Apology to the Roman Emperour, that by the Holy Spirit which came upon the Virgin, and cauſed her Conception, is at no hand to be underſtood any other than the *Word* or *Son of God*; contrary to the perpetual uſage of the Scripture, which by the Holy Spirit always meaneth, not the Second, but the Third Perſon of the HOLY TRINITY. Moreover, Were the opinion of the Adverſaries true, that the Son of God came down and took a Humane Nature of the Virgin, the Angel *Gabriel*, when the Virgin demanded of him, how ſhe ſhould conceive, would not have anſwered, Luke 1. 35. *The Holy Spirit ſhall come upon thee, and the Power of the Higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee: therefore alſo that Holy Thing which ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called the Son of God:* But, *the Son of God ſhall come upon thee, and the Eternal Word ſhall overſhadow thee: therefore alſo that Holy Thing which ſhall be born of thee, being aſſumed into the Unity of the Perſon of the Eternal Word, ſhall be called the Son of God.* Acts 10. 38. *God anointed Jeſus of* Nazareth *with the Holy Spirit, and with Power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppreſſed of the Devil: for God was with him.* Luk. 22. 43. *And there appeared an Angel to him* (Chriſt) *from Heaven, ſtrengthening him.* Mat. 27. 46. *Jeſus cried with a loud Voice, ſaying, My God, my*

Justin Martyr *is exceedingly puzzelled with this Objection, in his conference with* Trypho.

God, why hast thou forsaken me? What need was there that the Holy Spirit should be given unto Christ, to enable him to do Miracles; and an Angel appear from Heaven unto him to strengthen him? or why should he so earnestly expostulate with God for forsaking him, if Christ were he, by whom the First Creation was performed, had a Divine Nature, and was God himself? Could not he that first created the World, do Miracles without being impowered by another? Would it be said of him that had the Divine Nature, that he did Miracles, *because God was with him*, and not rather, *because he was God?* or needed he in his Agony to be strengthened by an Angel? would not the Divine Nature in Christ, at this rate, be in the mean time idle and useless? Could he that was very God himself, cry out, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* Was he his own God, and had forsaken himself? These things have I here set down, out of zeal to the true Son of God, the Man Christ Jesus, that the Adversaries may by this means be brought to bethink themselves, and not substitute a false one in his stead, namely an Eternal Son begotten out of the Substance of God, whereas there is no place in the Scripture that either saith, or intimateth any such thing. But they will say, that if Christ were not God, he could not satisfy for our Sins: which reason overthroweth it self, and sheweth their opinion concerning the Divine Nature of Christ to be fictitious. For how can God satisfy God? can any one make satisfaction to himself? Neither will it relieve them, to reply, that there are several Persons in God, and so the Second satisfied the First. For if there be Three Persons to whom we are indebted, and but one of them satisfied, we are in as bad a condition as before, in that we stand in need of some one to make satisfaction to the Second and Third Persons in God. If they further answer, That the Second freely forgiveth us; This will make him more bountiful than the First, who would not do it without receiving full satisfaction. But this Doctrine of the Satisfaction of Christ, as well as that of his two Natures whereon it is (though very ruinously) built, is a meer Device of Men, for neither is it expresst in Scripture, nor can solidly be deduced from thence, as I could quickly shew, were it not besides the business in hand.

Article IV.

Whence, though he be our God, by reason of his Divine Soveraignty over us, and Worship due to such Soveraignty, yet is he not the most high God, the same with the Father, but subordinate to him.

John 20. 17. *I* (Jesus) *ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.* Eph. 1. 17. *The God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory.* Heb. 1. 8, 9. *But to the Son* (or rather, *of the Son*) *he saith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a Scepter of Righteousness is the Scepter of thy Kingdom. Thou lovedst Righteousness, and hatedst Iniquity, therefore God,* (or rather, *O God,*) *thy God hath anointed thee with Oil of Gladness above thy Fellows.* In these places which we have cited, Christ as he is *the Son of God*, and *Lord*, yea *God*, is said to have a God, and therefore cannot be the most High God. Neither will this seem strange to him that considereth the Language of the Scripture, which expresly maketh mention of the most High God. Heb. 7. 1. *Melchisedeck King of* Salem, *Priest of the most High God*, and calleth the LORD the God of Gods, *Deut.* 10. 17. *The Lord your God is God of Gods, and Lord of Lords:* Both which places shew that there is one, by way of Excellency, or in the most perfect Manner called God, but others in a way of Subordination, or less perfect Manner, amongst whom Christ himself, (though otherwise far surpassing the rest,) is notwithstanding

ing ranked, as this place of the *Hebrews* doth evince beyond all gain-saying, in that it ſpeaketh of Chriſt as a God, when it ſaith he hath a God; ſo that there is no place left for the Adverſaries to baffle, telling us that this is ſpoken of Chriſt as Man, or according to his Humane Nature. Now for the further clearing of this Matter, I will here exactly unfold the Appellation of *God*, as I find it delineated in the Scripture: for many being ignorant thereof, hold very great and inexplicable Errours, touching the Godhead of Chriſt. Firſt therefore, the Appellation of *God* denoteth him that hath a ſupernatural living Subſtance, as Iſaiah 31. 3. *The* Egyptians *are Men, and not God; and their Horſes Fleſh, and not Spirit.* Ezek. 28. 2, 9. *Becauſe thy Heart is lifted up, and thou* (Prince of Tyrus) *haſt ſaid, I am a God, I ſit in the ſeat of God, in the midſt of the Seas; yet thou art a Man, and not a God, though thou ſet thine Heart as the Heart of God. Wilt thou ſay before him that ſlayeth thee, I am a God? But thou ſhalt be a Man, and no God, in the Hand of him that ſlayeth thee.* Which Words plainly intimate that by *God* is here meant a ſupernatural living Subſtance, that cannot die, whereas every natural living Subſtance may be ſlain. Thus is the LORD called God, and alſo the Angels, in that they are immortal. Secondly, Him that hath a ſupernatural Dominion, or ſuch a Dominion as is not managed in a Natural and Viſible way, but in a hidden manner, exceeding the limits of Nature. As *Numb.* 27. 16. *Let the LORD, the God of the Spirits of all Fleſh, ſet a Man over the Congregation.* Therefore *the God of the Spirits of Men,* becauſe he ruleth over them. But ſuch Rule or Dominion is more than natural, for they that exerciſe a natural or civil Dominion, have power over the Fleſh only; hence *Paul* ſaith, *Eph.* 6. 5. *Servants be obedient to your Maſters* (or, *Lords*) *according to the Fleſh,* oppoſing them to the Lord of their Spirits. In this ſenſe is the Lord alſo ſaid to be the God of Gods, *Pſal.* 136. 2. [*O give thanks to the God of Gods; for his Mercy endureth for ever:*] becauſe he exerciſeth Dominion over the Angels. Pſal. 103. 20. [*Bleſs the LORD ye his Angels that excel in Strength, that do his Commandments, hearkening to the Voice of his Word:*] but Angels, (as we formerly hinted) are in the Scripture called Gods, as Pſal. 97. 7. *Worſhip him all ye Gods.* This cannot be meant of Idols, for then the *Pſalmiſt,* who every-where deteſteth Idols, ſhould here bid them worſhip God; wherefore it is meant of Angels: ſee alſo Pſal. 8. 5. *Thou haſt made him* (Man) *a little lower than the Angels* (Heb. *than the Gods,* for ſo the word *Elohim,* here uſed, ſignifieth.) Now the Dominion which the Lord exerciſeth over Angels is not natural or civil, but exceeding the limits of Nature, in that the very Subjects of this Dominion are ſupernatural. Thirdly, Him that hath a ſublime Dominion conferred on him in a ſupernatural way; thus *Moſes* is called a God, *Exod.* 7. 1. [*And the Lord ſaid unto* Moſes, *See, I have made thee a God* (*Heb.* Elohim) *to* Pharoah.] And *Nebuchadnezzar,* Ezek. 31. 11. [*I have therefore delivered him* (Pharaoh) *into the Hand of the mighty One of the Heathen,* (Heb. *into the Hand of the God of the Nations,* Bejad El Gojim) meaning *Nebuchadnezzar,* as appeareth from chap. 30. 24.] for *Moſes* had his Dominion beſtowed on him immediately by God, as the Text it ſelf ſheweth, ſo alſo had *Nebuchadnezzar*; ſee Jer. 27. 4, 5, 6. *Thus ſaith the Lord of Hoſts, the God of* Iſrael, *I have made the Earth, the Man, and the Beaſt that are upon the Ground, by my Power, and by my out-ſtretched Arm, and have given it to whom it ſeemed meet to me. And now have I given all theſe Lands into the Hand of* Nebuchadnezzar *the King of* Babylon *my Servant, and the Beaſts of the Field have I given him alſo to ſerve him.* Fourthly, Him that is a Beſtower of ſupernatural Benefits. Thus is the LORD called *the God of* Abraham, *the God of* Iſaac, *and the God of* Jacob, *Exod.* 3. 6. becauſe he, (as the Divine Author to the *Hebrews* expoundeth it) *hath prepared for them a City,* even the Heavenly *Jeruſalem,* Heb. 11. 16. Fifthly, Him that is a ſoveraign Benefactor, beſtowing Benefits, (though in themſelves natural) yet in a ſupernatural way, as *Gen.* 17. 8. *And I will give unto thee, and to thy Seed after*

after thee, the Land wherein thou art a Stranger, all the Land of Canaan, for an everlasting Poſſeſſion; and I will be their God. Therefore their God, becauſe he gave them the Land of *Canaan*, which was done in a ſupernatural way. *For they got not the Land in poſſeſſion by their own Sword, neither did their own Arm ſave them: but thy right Hand, and thy Arm, and the Light of thy Countenance, becauſe thou hadſt a favour to them*, Pſal. 44. 3. See alſo *Exod.* 23. 23. *Mine Angel ſhall go before thee, and bring thee in unto the* Amorites, *and the* Hittites, *and the* Perizzites, *and the* Canaanites, *and the* Hivites, *and the* Jebuſites, *and I will cut them off.* In all theſe Reſpects is Chriſt now rightly ſtiled a God, having a ſupernatural, ſpiritual, and immortal Subſtance; a ſublime Dominion conferred on him in a ſupernatural way, even by God raiſing him up from the Dead, and ſetting him at his own right Hand in the heavenly Places; yea a ſupernatural Dominion, even over Angels and the Spirits of Men; being alſo a ſoveraign Beneſactor, as beſtowing Benefits (though in themſelves natural, as Health, and the like) yet in a ſupernatural way; yea beſtowing ſupernatural Benefits alſo, as the eternal Inheritance, and the Pledge thereof, the Holy Spirit. Neither was he deſtitute of ſupernatural Dominion, but was a God even whilſt he converſed with Men upon the Earth; for he had not only Authority over Diſeaſes and Devils to cure where, and when, and whom he pleaſed, but could give Authority to his Diſciples to cure Diſeaſes and caſt out Devils, and that in his name. See Luke 9. 1. *Then he* (Chriſt) *called his twelve Diſciples together, and gave them Power and Authority over all Devils, and to cure Diſeaſes.* Luke 10. 16. *And the Seventy returned again with joy, ſaying, Lord, even the Devils are ſubject unto us through* (Gr. *in*) *thy Name.* Yea ſome that did not follow him, and ſo were not his Diſciples, could notwithſtanding caſt out Devils in his Name. Luke 9. 49. John *anſwered and ſaid, Maſter, we ſaw one caſting out Devils in thy Name, and we forbad him, becauſe he followeth not with us.* And this (to give a hint by the way to them who are inquiſitive after the Truth) putteth a manifeſt difference between the manner wherein Chriſt gave power to the Diſciples to cure and caſt out Devils, and the manner wherein the Holy Spirit; for we read expreſly, 1 Cor. 12. 9, 10. *That the Holy Spirit gave the Gifts of Healing, and the Operations of Miracles,* (or, as the Gr. hath it, *of mighty Works.*) Amongſt which mighty Works, the caſting out of Devils is comprehended. For Chriſt gave them power to cure Diſeaſes and caſt out Devils, in his Name; ſee Acts 3. 6. *Then* Peter *ſaid* (to the Cripple) *Silver and Gold have I none, but ſuch as I have, I give thee: In the Name of Jeſus Chriſt of* Nazareth, *riſe up and walk.* And Acts 16. 18. Paul *being grieved, turned, and ſaid to the Spirit, I command thee in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt to come out of her. And he came out the ſame hour.* But we never read that any of the Diſciples did ever perform Cures, or caſt out Devils in the Name of the Holy Spirit.

But let us now proceed to other Teſtimonies of the Scripture, from whence it may appear, that though Chriſt be a God, yet he is not the moſt high God: ſee Iſa. 9. 6, 7. *Unto us a Child is born, and unto us a Son is given, and the Government ſhall be upon his Shoulder; and his Name ſhall be called Wonderful, Counſellor, a mighty God,* (ſo it is in the Original, which hath ſimply *El Gibbor*, not *Hatl Haggibbor*, the mighty God, as the Lord of Hoſts is ſtiled, *Jer.* 32. 18.) *a Father of the Age,* (or, *of Eternity*) *a Prince of Peace. Of the increaſe of his Government and Peace there ſhall be no end; upon the Throne of David, and over his Kingdom, to order it and eſtabliſh it with Judgment and Juſtice, from henceforth even for ever; the Zeal of the Lord of Hoſts will perform this.* In this Paſſage it is remarkable, that the Prophet, after he had called Chriſt (for undoubtedly this Place doth in the full and perfect ſenſe of the Words agree to him, tho it might in a reſtrained manner be applied to *Hezekiah*) after, I ſay, he had called Chriſt *a mighty God*, and given him other excellent and divine Elogies, he faith in the cloſe of all, *that the Zeal of the Lord of Hoſts will perform this*; there-

thereby diſtinguiſhing Chriſt from the Lord of Hoſts, and making his Godhead dependent on the Bounty of the Lord of Hoſts, who would out of his Zeal cauſe Chriſt to become a mighty God: ſo that Chriſt is not the moſt High God, but a God ſubordinate to him; which ſhall be further made appear from the other Texts of the Scripture, wherein Chriſt hath the Appellation of God given to him. The firſt is, *Rom.* 9. 5. where the Apoſtle ſpeaketh in this manner; *Whoſe are the Fathers, and of whom according to the Fleſh Chriſt came, who is over all a God to be bleſſed for ever. A God*, ſo the Greek hath it, wherein θεὸς is put without an Article; and were it here uſed as a proper Name, (for ſo it ſometimes is in the Scripture) the words *over all* would be needleſs (being implied in it) nor could be conſtrued with the ſame, for is it congruous to ſay, *Who is Moſes*, or *David over all?* Neither let the Adverſaries here object that *Jehovah* is a proper Name, and yet it is often ſaid in the Scripture, *Jehovah Sebaoth*, that is, *Jehovah*, or *the Lord of Hoſts*: for it is evident from the Scripture, that in this Expreſſion there is a defect of the word *God*, as appeareth from 1 Chron. 11. 9. [*ſo David waxed greater and greater: for the LORD of Hoſts was with him.*] compared with 2 Sam. 5. 10. *And David went on and grew great, and the LORD God of Hoſts was with him.* Wherefore the foreſaid Paſſage of the *Romans* doth not ſhew that Chriſt is the moſt High God, but rather the contrary, eſpecially, becauſe the place of the *Hebrews*, which we formerly diſcuſſed, plainly giveth us to underſtand, that Chriſt is ſo *a God over all*, as that he himſelf in the mean time hath a God. For that he is not *a God over all* none excepted, is apparent, for then he would be *a God* over the Father alſo, which every one will confeſs to be moſt falſe. But we our ſelves readily grant that he is *a God over all* ſave the Father, *who hath ſet him at his own right Hand in the Heavenly places, far above all Principality, and Authority, and Power, and Dominion, and every Name named not only in this World, but alſo in that to come. And hath put all things in ſubjection under his Feet, and given him Head over all things to the Church*, and ſo made him *a God over all*, ſuch Dignity not being Civil, but Divine; *Eph.* 1. 20, 21, 22. and who is therefore not only in the 17*th* verſe of the ſame Chapter, but elſewhere frequently ſtiled by the Apoſtle, *the God of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*. Furthermore (that we may add this Conſideration alſo, which will not a little clear that Paſſage of the *Romans*, and confirm our Aſſertion concerning the Godhead of Chriſt) when the Apoſtle ſaith, *that Chriſt came of the Father's according to the Fleſh, who is over all a God to be bleſſed for ever*, the oppoſition is not entire and exact, as wanting the other Member. What that Member is, another Paſſage of the Apoſtle, wherein you have the ſame oppoſition in deſcribing Chriſt, will inform you, it is Rom. 1. 3, 4. *Concerning his Son Jeſus Chriſt, our Lord, who was made* (or rather, *born*) *of the Seed of David according to the Fleſh, and declared to be the Son of God with Power* (Gr. *determined*, or *ordained Son of God in Power*) *according to the Spirit of Holineſs, by the Reſurrection from the Dead.* Here you ſee that to thoſe Words, *according to the Fleſh*, are oppoſed theſe, *according to the Spirit of Holineſs*. Again, what this *Spirit of Holineſs* is, will be no hard matter to find out, if we conſider, that as *the Fleſh* ſignifieth a conſtituting part of Chriſt, namely his Fleſhly Body; ſo alſo muſt *the Spirit of Holineſs*, oppoſed thereunto, ſignify a conſtituting part. If ſo, then it is not the Holy Spirit, as every one will confeſs, nor the Reaſonable Soul of Chriſt; becauſe he is intimated to have had this *Spirit* by means of the Reſurrection from the Dead, whereas he had a Reaſonable Soul before his Death. Nor the Divine Nature, for that is no where in the Scripture deſigned by the Name of *Spirit*, or *Spirit of Holineſs*.

Beſides, The Adverſaries hold, that Chriſt had the Divine Nature whilſt he was yet clothed with Fleſh. It remains therefore that by *Spirit of Holineſs*, which Chriſt had by means of the Reſurrection of the Dead, and is a conſtituting Part of him, is to be underſtood his *Holy Spiritual Body*, whereby he is excepted from other Men, being the firſt-born from the Dead, or the firſt that

ſo

ſo roſe from the Dead, as that he never died again, but was clothed with a *Spiritual Body*, and made like to God, who is a Spirit. And now the ſenſe of that Paſſage beginneth to appear, Heb. 9. 14. *How much more ſhall the Blood of Chriſt, who through the Eternal Spirit* (Gr. *through an Eternal Spirit*, for no Article is perfixed,) *offered himſelf without ſpot to God, purge your Conſciences from dead Works to ſerve the living God?* By *Eternal Spirit*, is here meant *the Spiritual Body* of Chriſt, which laſteth to all Eternity; and this Expreſſion is oppoſed to what the ſame Divine Author ſpeaketh of Chriſt, *Heb.* 5. 7. *Who in days of the Fleſh*, &c. for *Eternal* is contrary to *Days*, and *Spirit* to *Fleſh*. Neither will that which we have here ſpoken ſeem ſtrange to him, who having penetrated into that profound Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, knoweth (what is there frequently intimated) that Chriſt then made his Offring for our Sins, when, after his Reſurrection, he entred into Heaven, and being endued with a Spiritual and Immortal Body, preſented himſelf before God. For ſo the Type of the Levitical High Prieſt making the yearly Atonement for the Sins of the People (*Levit.* 16.) did require. For as the Atonement was not then made, when he ſlew the Beaſts, but when, having put on his Linen Robes, he brought their Blood into the Sanctuary before the Mercy-Seat: ſo neither did Chriſt offer his Sacrifice for our Sins upon the Croſs, but when after his Reſurrection, being clothed with Robes of Glory and Immortality, he entred into Heaven, the true Sanctuary, and preſented himſelf to God. Wherefore (to return to the aforeſaid Paſſage, *Rom.* 9. 5.) when it is here ſaid; *Of whom according to the Fleſh* (for ſo the Greek hath it) *Chriſt came, who is over all a God to be bleſſed for ever*, we ought (by the Authority of the Apoſtle himſelf) to ſupply in our Mind the other Member of the Oppoſition, and to underſtand the place, as if it had been ſaid, *Who according to the Spirit of Holineſs by the Reſurrection from the dead, is over all a God bleſſed for ever.* But if Chriſt be *according to the Spirit of Holineſs by the Reſurrection from the dead*, (that is) *according to his Holy Spiritual Body which he received by means of the Reſurrection from the Dead, the Son of God in Power*, and accordingly *a God over all*, he is not *the Son of God in power*, and accordingly *a God over all*, by having the Divine Nature perſonally united to his Humane Nature, but by the Glorification and Exaltation of his very Humane Nature, and ſo is not the *moſt High God*, but *a God* ſubordinate to him.

The next Place is that, John 20. 28, 29. *And* Thomas *anſwered and ſaid unto him, My Lord, and my God. Jeſus ſaith unto him*, Thomas, *becauſe thou haſt ſeen me, thou haſt believed.* The Words of Chriſt plainly ſhew, that *Thomas* believed him to be his Lord, and his God, becauſe he had ſeen him, being raiſed from the Dead. Doth this now argue Chriſt to be the moſt *High God?* Yea it ſtrongly proveth the contrary, in that the Scripture elſewhere calleth the moſt *High God, Inviſible*, 1 Tim. 1. 17. and ſaith, *that none of Men* (ſo the Greek hath it) *hath ſeen, nor can ſee him*, 1 Tim. 6. 14, 15, 16. whereas on the contrary it calleth Chriſt *the Image of the inviſible God*, Col. 1. 15. But it is impoſſible for him that is *the Inviſible God*, to be *the Image of the Inviſible God*, unleſs any Man will be ſo abſurd as to ſay, that he is the Image of himſelf. John 1. 1. *In the beginning* (not of the World, but of the Goſpel, ſee *Mark* 1. 1. *Luke* 1. 2. and 1 *John* 1. 1. and *Chap.* 2. 7, 13, 14, 24. and 3. 11. and *Epiſt.* 2, 5, 6. for theſe Words [*in the beginning*] are wont to be reſtrained to the matter in Hand, which here is the Goſpel, as appeareth from the very Appellation of the *Word*, which is here given to Chriſt, in regard of his Prophetical Office, in publiſhing the Goſpel) *was the Word* (that is, *the Man Chriſt Jeſus* called *the Word*, in that He was the immediate Interpreter of God, by whom he revealed his Counſel touching our Salvation, as we are wont to diſcloſe our Secrets by our Words; which reaſon may not obſcurely be collected from the 18*th verſe* of the ſame *Chapter*) *and the Word was with God*, (being taken up into Heaven, that ſo he might talk

talk with God, and be indeed his *Word*, or the immediate Interpreter of his Will, and receive the moſt certain and abſolute knowledg of the Kingdom of Heaven, which he was to propoſe to Men. See *Joh.* 6. 38, 46, 51, 62 where Chriſt affirmeth, *That he came down from Heaven, and had ſeen God: and that as he was the living Bread, which came down from Heaven, whereof whoſoever did eat, ſhould live for ever; ſo the Bread which he would give, was his Fleſh, which he would give for the Life of the World.* And afterwards asketh the Jews, *what if they ſhould ſee the Son of Man aſcending up where he was before?* namely, before he began to preach the Goſpel, as he himſelf intimateth, *Joh.* 8. 42. where he ſaith, *If God were your Father, ye would love me, for I went out from God, and came; for neither came I of my Self, but He ſent me.* And John 16. 28. where he ſaith, *I came out from the Father, and came into the World: Again* (or rather, *on the contrary*) *I leave the World, and go to the Father.* Which *going forth from the Father*, every one may eaſily perceive, by the oppoſition of the following clauſe, is meant of a Local Proceſſion of Chriſt from God; and that before the diſcharge of his Embaſſy: for *to come*, or *to come into the World*, ſignifieth to treat with Men in the Name of God, and to perform a publick Office among them; See *Joh.* 1. 15, 27, 30. and 1 *Joh.* 5. 20. *Mat.* 11. 3, 18, 19. *Joh.* 17. 18. compared with *Chap.* 16. 21. and *Ch.* 18. 37. *And the Word was a God*, (as being endued with Divine Power and Empire:) for according to the reaſoning of Chriſt himſelf, *Joh.* 10. 35. if the Pſalmiſt call them Gods, to whom *the vocal Word of God* came, and the Scripture cannot be broken, (as it would, if any one ſhould deny them to be Gods:) is not he much more a God, who is endued with ſo divine a Dominion, that he is *the very ſubſtantial Word of God?* This paſſage alſo ſheweth, that Chriſt is not the moſt high God, the ſame with the Father. For when he is ſaid *to have been with God*, the word [*God*] there, by the confeſſion of all, ſignifieth the moſt high God, (ſince the very Article ſet before it in the Greek, importeth ſo much); and therefore when he himſelf is afterwards ſaid to be *a God*, (with the omiſſion of the foreſaid Article in the Greek) neither will the words, nor thing it ſelf, ſuffer Chriſt to be the ſame God with Him, with whom he was; that is, *the moſt High God*) for then he would have been ſaid to be with himſelf, which is ridiculous. So that theſe words, which are uſually brought to prove the ſupreme Divinity of Chriſt, being well examined, do quite overthrow it. Thus have we retorted all the places of the Scripture, wherein the Appellation of God is given to Chriſt, againſt the Adverſaries, ſhewing from them that Chriſt is not the moſt High God. But were all that we have ſaid, laid aſide, this very thing (if Men had not renounced their Reaſon, and made Nonſenſe the Mother of their Devotion) is ſufficient to decide the Controverſy, namely, that Chriſt is called in the Scripture *the Son of the moſt High God.* For if he be both *the Son of the moſt High God*, and *the moſt High God* too, he will be the Son of himſelf, which is abſurd.

ARTICLE V.

AGain; Though he be a God, ſubordinate to the moſt High God, as having received his Godhead, and whatſoever he hath, from the Father; yet may not any one thence rightly infer, that by this Account there will be another God, or two Gods? For though we may, with allowance of the Scripture, ſay, that there are many Gods, yet neither will the Scripture, nor the thing it ſelf permit us to ſay, that there is another God, or two Gods: becauſe when a word in its own nature common to many, hath been appropriated, and aſcribed to one by way of Excellency, (as that of God hath been to

the Father:) albeit this doth not hinder us from saying, that there are many of that Name; yet doth it from saying, that there is another, or two, since that would be all one as if we should say, that there is another, or two most Excellent, (which is absurd:) for when two are segregated in this manntr out of many, they claim Excellency to themselves alike. Thus though some faithful Man be a Son of God, subordinate to the chief Son of God Christ Jesus, yet may we not thereupon say, that there is another Son of God, or two Sons of God, (since that would be to make another, or two Sons of God by way of Excellency, whereas there can be but one such a Son) howbeit otherwise the Scripture warrants us to say, that there are many Sons of God.

1 Cor. 8. 4, 5, 6. *We know that there is no Idol* (so the Greek hath it) *in the World, and that there is no other God but one. For though there be called Gods,* (so the Greek hath it) *whether in the Heaven, or on the Earth, (as there are many Gods, and many Lords:) Yet to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all the things,* (so the Greek hath it) *and we for him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all the things, and we by him.* Heb. 2. 10. *It became Him, for whom are all the things,* (so the Greek hath it) *and by whom are all the things,* (that is, God) *in bringing many Sons to Glory, to make the Captain of their Salvation perfect through Sufferings.*

Article VI.

I Believe that there is one principal Minister of God and Christ, peculiarly sent from Heaven to sanctify the Church, who, by reason of his eminency and intimacy with God, is singled out of the number of the other Heavenly Ministers or Angels, and comprised in the Holy TRINITY, being the Third Person thereof; and that this Minister of God and Christ is the Holy Spirit.

John 14. 26. *But the Comforter,* (or rather *Advocate*, as the word in the Greek importeth, and *Beza* accordingly rendreth it, *Advocatus*) *which is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my Name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.* Where note by the way, that the Holy Spirit is called the *Advocate*, (which very Appellation sufficiently intimates, that he is not that Supreme and Independent Monarch *Jehovah*) chiefly for two Reasons. 1. Because he instructeth the Saints, especially when they are brought before persecuting Rulers, how to plead their own, and their Master Christ's Cause: See *Matth.* 10. 17, 18, &c. *John* 16. 7, *&c.* In opposition whereunto, the unclean Spirit Satan is called the *Adversary*, 1 *Pet.* 5. 8. namely, in that he suggesteth Slanders, and false Accusations to the Men of this World, against Christ and his People; see *John* 8. 38, 44. Secondly, Because when the Saints sink under some great Pressure and Affliction, and are at a loss, not knowing which way to turn themselves, nor what to pray for as they ought, then comes in the Holy Spirit to their assistance, and intercedeth, with most earnest and unexpressible Groans to God in their behalf, *Rom.* 8. 26, 27. In opposition whereunto, the unclean Spirit, Satan, is called *the Accuser of the Brethren*, in that *he accuseth them Night and Day before the Throne of God*, Rev. 12. 10. Job 1. 9. & Chap. 2, 4, 5. Note also, that the Holy Spirit is said *to be sent*, and that *in the Name of another*, yea *of a Man*, (since not only the thing it self, but also the whole tenour of Christ's Discourse intimateth, that he speaks of himself as a Man);

but

but it is abſurd to ſay, *that the moſt High God can be ſent*, (ſince that is proper to Inferiors and Miniſters); more abſurd yet to ſay, *that he can be ſent in the Name of another*; but moſt abſurd of all to ſay, *that he can be ſent in the Name of a Man*. John 15. 26. *But when the Advocate is come, whom I will ſend you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, that proceedeth* (or, *goeth out*) *from the Father, He ſhall teſtify of me.* This Deſcription of the Holy Spirit, namely, *that he proceedeth from the Father*, ſerveth to ſhew both the Reaſon of our Saviour's former words, wherein he had ſaid that *He would ſend the Holy Spirit from the Father*; and alſo that the Holy Spirit is of moſt intimate admiſſion with the Father; and as I may ſo ſpeak, *Legatus à latere*. And indeed, were not Men blinded with Romiſh Tradition, they would never draw ſuch a monſtrous concluſion from theſe words, as they are wont to do; namely, becauſe the Holy Spirit is here ſaid *to proceed from the Father*, that therefore he receiveth the Divine Eſſence, and conſequently is God, by eternal proceſſion from the Father, (for as for his proceſſion from the Son, though that be riſe in Mens Mouths, yet doth not the Scripture make mention of it any where): Which Eſſential and Eternal Proceſſion, is not only in it ſelf abſurd, but hath alſo no good footing in this Text, (nor pretendeth to have footing in any other) and is therefore to be rejected, as a bold and ſenſeleſs figment of Man's Brain. For obſerve that it is not here ſaid of the Holy Spirit, ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός, *he proceedeth out of the Father*, (though even then that Eſſential Proceſſion could not have ſolidly been inferred thence, for ἐκπορεύεσθαι, or (which is all one) ἐξελθεῖν ἔκ τινος, being ſpoken of a Perſon, is wont to be underſtood of a Local Proceſſion; See *John* 8. 42. *Act.* 15. 24. 1 *Joh.* 2. 19.) but ἐκπορεύεται παρὰ τοῦ Πατρός, i. *he proceedeth from the Father.* Now ἐκπορεύεσθαι παρά τινος, i. *to proceed from one*, being ſpoken of a Perſon, every puny in Greek can tell, ſignifieth his going from one's Houſe, or Preſence, and ſo intimates only a Local Proceſſion; which made *Beza*, in his Annotations on this place, ingenuouſly confeſs, that this Deſcription concerneth not the Eſſence of the Holy Spirit. Wherefore this place is ſo far from proving, that it quite ſubverteth the ſuppoſed Deity of the Holy Spirit; ſince, if he were God, he could not locally proceed from any one, inaſmuch as he would then not only be in another's Manſion, but alſo change place; whereas God, by the confeſſion of all, as he cannot be in any Manſion that is not his own, ſo neither doth he ſhift place: *John* 16. 7, 8, &c. *Nevertheleſs, I tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Advocate will not come unto you: but if I depart, I will ſend him to you. And when he is come, he ſhall convince the World of Sin, of Righteouſneſs, and of Judgment. I have yet many things to ſay unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he ſhall lead you into all the Truth*, (namely, of thoſe things which Chriſt had yet to ſay to them) *for he ſhall not ſpeak of himſelf; but whatſoever he ſhall hear, that ſhall he ſpeak*, (which words clearly intimate, that the Holy Spirit could not lead the Diſciples into all the truth of thoſe things that Chriſt had yet to ſay to them, unleſs they were firſt diſcloſed to the Spirit himſelf by Chriſt) *and he ſhall ſhew you things to come. He ſhall glorify me, for he ſhall receive of mine, and ſhew it to you.* This thing doth indeed ſet forth the tranſcendent Glory of Chriſt, namely, that whereas he himſelf, while he led a mortal Life here on the Earth, was wont in many things to be taught by the Spirit; ſee *Iſa.* 11. 1, 2. yet after his Exaltation, he ſhould not only ſend the Holy Spirit, but alſo give him Inſtructions concerning what he was to make known unto the Diſciples. The fulfilling whereof may be ſeen in the three firſt Chapters of the *Revelation*. For he that there ſpeaketh to *John*, is not Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, both becauſe in the entrance of *Chap.* 1. it is ſaid that Jeſus Chriſt ſignified the Revelation to his Servant *John*; not by himſelf, but *ſending by his Angel*; and alſo becauſe in the 13*th* Verſe of the ſame Chapter *John* ſaith, that *he ſaw one like to the Son of Man*; but if ſo, then he was not the Son of Man himſelf. Who that Angel there-

fore is, that there ſpeaketh to *John*, in the Perſon and Name of Chriſt, may eaſily be gathered from the *Epiphonema*, or Acclamation, put at the cloſe of every Epiſtle directed to the ſeven *Aſian* Churches, where the Angel having before ſpoken in the Perſon of Chriſt, now ſpeaketh in his own Perſon, ſaying, *He that hath an Ear to hear, let him hear what the Spirit ſaith unto the Churches*; thereby ſufficiently giving us to underſtand that he was the Holy Spirit; who being appointed by Chriſt to guide and inſtruct his People, ought to be hearkned to. Epheſ. 4. 4, 5, 6. *There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye have been called in one Hope of your Calling; One Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm; One God and Father of all, who is over all, and among all, and in you all.* 1 Cor. 12. 4, 5, 6. *There are diverſities of Gifts, but the ſame Spirit. And there are diverſities of Adminiſtrations, but the ſame Lord. And there are diverſities of Operations, but it is the ſame God that worketh all in all*, (namely, as the primary Author; whereas the Lord Jeſus worketh them as the ſecondary Efficient; and the Holy Spirit as the Inſtrument, to whom, as being a moſt wiſe and faithful Steward and Deputy (they are the Expreſſions of *Tertullian, who truly and appoſitely called the Holy Spirit, *Patris villicum, Chriſti vicarium*) God and Chriſt gave leave, for the confirmation of the Goſpel, to diſtribute the ſpiritual Gifts here ſpecified, according to his own will, as you may ſee, both in the 11th Verſe of this very Chapter, and *Heb.* 2. 3.)

* *Præſcr. Adv. Hæret. cap.* 28.

Theſe two Paſſages, though we could produce no others out of Scripture, are abundantly ſufficient to refute the vulgar Opinion touching the Deity of the Holy Spirit, ſince the Apoſtle doth expreſly and purpoſely diſtinguiſh him from *that one God*, and *that one Lord of Chriſtians*. But if he be neither *that one God*, nor *that one Lord of Chriſtians*, certainly he can be no other than a Miniſtring Spirit. Wherefore it is palpably evident from hence, that the *TRINITY*, which the Apoſtle *Paul* believed, conſiſteth of *one God, one Lord, and one Spirit*, but not of three Perſons in one God; otherwiſe God himſelf will be one of the three Perſons in God, which to aſſert is very abſurd. So that thoſe Chriſtians that pretend (and indeed they do but pretend) to admit nothing but the Scripture for the Rule of their Faith, may be aſhamed to ſwerve from the Apoſtle's Doctrine in a thing ſo plainly and poſitively delivered by him, and which ſo nearly concerneth both the Glory of God, and the Salvation of Men; ſince this very Opinion of three Perſons in God, is not only the Source of almoſt all the Errors commonly held amongſt Chriſtians, which are many and groſs, but alſo the main Stumbling-block that keeps many thouſands from entring into the Church of Chriſt, in that they apprehend this to be the Error of the Chriſtian Religion it ſelf, whereas it is only the Error of thoſe that profeſs it. 1 *Cor.* 2. 10, 11. *But God hath revealed them to us by his Spirit:* (mark how the Spirit is not only diſtinguiſhed from God, but alſo made the Inſtrument whereby he revealeth the Myſteries of the Goſpel;) *for the Spirit ſearcheth all things* (that is, all things pertaining to the Salvation of Men; for the word [*all*] is wont to be reſtrained to the matter in hand: thus in *Verſe* 15. of this very *Chap. the ſpiritual Man is ſaid to judg or diſcern all things, even the Depths of God.* (Thus ſome Men are ſaid to be acquainted with the *Depths of Satan*, Rev. 2. 24.) *For who of Men knoweth the things of a Man, ſave the Spirit of Man that is in him? Even ſo the things of God knoweth none but the Spirit of God:* (He doth not add, as before, *that is in him.*) When the Apoſtle here ſaith, *That none knoweth the things of God but the Spirit of God*, the excluſive Particle [*none*] is put to exclude ſome Perſons; thoſe Perſons muſt of neceſſity be either Humane, Angelical, or Divine, ſince no other Perſons are to be found. Not Humane Perſons, for then the Holy Spirit will be in the number of Men, (which is abſurd,) ſince that only is wont to be excepted, which is otherwiſe comprehended under the general Name; and which, if it had not expreſly been excepted,

ed, would have been thought to be included. Not Divine Perſons, for then the ſecond Perſon, which is commonly held, will be excluded: For if no Divine Perſon *know the things of God*, (that is, of the Father, for he, by the confeſſion of all, is here ſignified by the Name of God) but the Spirit, then the ſecond Perſon would not know them, which overturneth the ſuppoſition of the Adverſaries, touching the three Perſons of God. It remaineth therefore that the excluſive Particle [*none*] is here made uſe of to exclude Angelical Perſons, and conſequently, that the Holy Spirit is in the number of Angels, otherwiſe he needed not to have been by Name excepted. Whence we may collect, That of all the Heavenly Miniſters, the Holy Spirit was firſt made acquainted with the Secrets of God, touching the Goſpel; and accordingly he above others was employed in revealing them to the Apoſtles, according to the reaſoning of *Paul* himſelf in this place: which thing argueth his intimacy with God, and eminency above all the reſt of the Heavenly Hoſt; and likewiſe affordeth us the reaſon, why he in the Scripture is ſometimes exempted out of the Appellation of Angels; it being uſual for one to be exempted out of the Appellation of thoſe of his kind, by reaſon of ſome Excellency. Thus *Peter* is ſegregated from the Apoſtles, becauſe he had the preheminence among them, 1 *Cor.* 9. 5. And *Saul* is diſtinguiſhed from the Enemies of *David*, not becauſe he was none of them, but in that he was the chief of them, *Pſal.* 18. 1. And upon the ſame account Chriſt Jeſus is ſometimes in the Scripture diſtinguiſhed from Men; ſee *Gal.* 1 1, 12. *Heb.* 7. 28.

And theſe things, (Chriſtian Reader) have I urged, ſuppoſing the holy Spirit to be a Perſon, as moſt of the Adverſaries hold. Yet foraſmuch as ſome (who otherwiſe aſſent to the truth concerning the Holy Spirit) miſtake in denying his Perſonality, I think good here to confirm it. Conſider therefore the places which I have cited out of the 14*th*, 15*th*, and 16*th* of *John*; and when thou haſt ſeriouſly (laying aſide all prejudice) ſo done, it will be impoſſible for thee (eſpecially being thus admoniſhed) to embrace either the Opinion of *Athanaſius*, who held the Holy Spirit to be a Perſon of Supream Deity, or that of *Socinus*, who believed him to be the Divine Power or Efficacy, but no Perſon. The Error of *Athanaſius* I have already briefly in this Article confuted, but more largely in the foregoing twelve Arguments. As for that of *Socinus*, tell me, (whoſoever thou art that adhereſt thereunto) whether Chriſt would have called the Holy Spirit, *the Advocate*, if he had not been a Perſon? Can any thing but a Perſon diſcharge ſuch an Office, have ſuch a title? Thou wilt ſay, *David* calleth the Teſtimonies of God, *his Counſellors*, *Pſal.* 119. 24. Right. But doth he ſo call them *Counſellors*, as Chriſt calleth the Holy Spirit *Advocate*? Doth he put the word *Counſellors* ſimply and by it ſelf, or (as the Learned phraſe it) *ſubjectively*, for the Teſtimonies of God? Doth he ſay, *I will ſpeak of the Counſellors*, or *turn my Feet to the Counſellors?* or, *I have kept the Counſellors*, thereby intending the Teſtimonies of God? But Chriſt ſaith, *If I go not away, the Advocate will not come*; and *I will pray the Father, and he ſhall give you another Advocate*, and *when the Advocate is come, whom I will ſend you from the Father*; thereby meaning (as he explains himſelf) the Holy Spirit. Thou wilt reply, that *Wiſdom*, *Prov.* 8. is brought in as a Perſon, which notwithſtanding is no Perſon. But how can it be made appear that by *Wiſdom* in this place is not meant a Perſon, by a *Metonymie* or *Tranſnomination*, called *Wiſdom*? Certainly the Circumſtances of the place intimate the contrary: for thus *Wiſdom* ſpeaketh, *I love them that love me*; *and thoſe that ſeek me early, ſhall find me. The Lord poſſeſſed me in the beginning of his way, before his Works of old. I was ſet up* (or, *anointed*, as the Hebrew word ſignifieth) *from everlaſting, from the beginning, or ever the Earth was. When there were no Depths, I was brought forth* (or, *formed*,) *when there were no Fountains abounding with Water. When he prepared the Heavens, I was there*; *when he appointed the Foundations*

of

of the Earth: Then was I by him, as one brought up with him (Heb. a Foster-child, or (as the Septuagint intimate) an Artist) and I was daily his delight, rejoycing always before him: Rejoycing in the habitable part of his Earth, and my Delights were with the Sons of Men. Is it possible for the wit of Man, with any probability, to devise how these things should be applied to that which is no Person? Who this Person is, I have formerly shewn, even the Person under contestation, the Holy Spirit, who moved on the Waters, when God was about to create the World; whose delights are with the Sons of Men; and he accordingly called *the Spirit of Grace*, for the favour that he beareth towards them; who may aptly be called *Wisdom*, and say, *Counsil is mine, I have strength*; being *the Spirit of Wisdom, Counsil, and Might, or Strength*, as *Isaiah*, Chap. 11. testifieth. Again, how could Christ say, *that the Spirit should not speak of himself, but what he should hear*, if he were not a Person? How, *that he should receive of his, and declare it to the Disciples?* Certainly they that adhere to the Doctrine of *Socinus* touching Christ (wherein without question that Man saw the Truth) must either renounce it, and return to *Athanasius*, or embrace this which I hold touching the Person of the Holy Spirit. For is it imaginable that the Holy Spirit, being the Power and Efficacy of God, immediately flowing out of his Essence, should hear from Christ, and receive of his, when in the mean time neither is himself a Person, nor hath Christ the same Divine Essence? Furthermore, how could the Holy Spirit *search all things, even the Depths of God?* 1 Cor. 2. How *make intercession for the Saints with groans unutterable?* Rom. 8. How could he say to the Christians at *Antioch*, *Separate me* Barnabas *and* Saul, *for the Work whereunto I have called them?* Act. 13. 2. How to *Peter*, *Behold, three Men seek thee; Arise therefore, and get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing; for I have sent them?* How could it be said of him, *that he distributeth Spiritual Gifts as he will?* 1 Cor. 12. 11. How could we be exhorted by the Apostle, *not to grieve the Holy Spirit?* Eph. 4. 30. How finally could Christ command his Apostles *to baptize all the discipled Nations into the Name, as of the Father, and the Son, so also of the Holy Spirit?* If these things, and sundry more which may be alledged out of the Scripture, do not evince the Holy Spirit to be a Person, what can? But the Adversaries, with whom we have now to deal, will object, that several things are in like manner ascribed to the Holy Spirit, which agree not to a Person. Thus is he said to be *an Earnest* (or rather, as the Greek word ἀῤῥαβὼν signifieth, a *Pledg*. See *Gen.* 38. 17, 18. Ἡ δῶσον ἐὰν δῷς μοι ἀῤῥαβῶνα, ἕως τοῦ ἀποστεῖλαί σε. Ὁ δὲ εἶπε, τίνα τὸν ἀῤῥαβῶνα δώσω σοι; that is, according to the English Translation, *Wilt thou give me a Pledg till thou send it? And he said, What Pledg shall I give thee?* See also *Verse* 20. κομίσασθαι παρὰ τῆς γυναικὸς τὸν ἀῤῥαβῶνα, *to receive the Pledg from the Womans Hand:*) *and to be shed upon the faithful*; and they said *to be Anointed, Baptized*, and *Sealed with the Holy Spirit*; and God *to give the Spirit*. But it is easy to shew that such things as these are in the Scripture, and other approved Writers, attributed to Persons; but such Personal things as we have before rehearsed concerning the Holy Spirit, are never in the Scripture, or other approved Authors, (unless Poets, to whom liberty of Fiction is granted, and who consequently may make Persons of what they please) attributed to them that are not Persons. For instance, *Terence* in *Heaut. Act.* 3. *Sc.* 3. calleth a Damsel *a Pledge*, saying,

Ea mortua est. Reliquit filiam adolescentulam: Ea relicta huic arrhaboni est pro illo argento.

Which place further sheweth the true signification of *Arrhabo* to be that which we formerly assigned. Likewise *Paul* saith, *Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ*, Rom. 13. 14. And, *My little Children, of whom I travel in birth again until Christ be formed in you*, Gal. 4. 19. And, *As ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord, walk ye in him*, Col. 2. 6. And, *Ye are our Epistle written in our Hearts, known and read of all Men*, 2 Cor. 3. 2. And, *The*

Seal

Seal of my Apoſtleſhip are ye in the Lord, 1 Cor. 9. 2. And Chriſt himſelf, *None can come unto me, except it were given* (or rather, *except there be given*) *to him of my Father*, (the Gr. hath it, ἐκ τῦ Πατρὸς, the ſame expreſſion that is uſed, when it is ſaid, *that God hath given us of his Spirit*, 1 Joh. 4. 13. ἐκ τῦ πνεύματος ἀυτῦ.) You ſee, by what hath been alledged, that either the very ſame impersonal Expreſſions, which are attributed to the Holy Spirit, are alſo attributed to other Perſons, or other Expreſſions altogether as far diſtant from Perſonality. Wherefore it will be far more ſuitable, by a *Metonymy*, or *Metaphor*, (uſual enough in ſuch caſes) to ſalve theſe few impersonal Expreſſions, attributed to the Holy Spirit, being a Perſon, as the tenor of the Scripture exhibiteth him to us; than by a *Proſopopœia*, (which muſt of neceſſity prove very uncouth and monſtrous) to elude thoſe many perſonal Expreſſions attributed to the Holy Spirit, being no Perſon, as only ſome few places ſeem to hold him forth to us. Having ſufficiently aſſerted the perſonality of the Holy Spirit, let us now, in the cloſe of all, ſpeak briefly of what is peculiar to him. I omit what *Siracides* ſaith of the Holy Spirit under the Name of *Wiſdom*, he being the Spirit of Wiſdom, namely, *that he came out of the Mouth of the moſt High*, Chap. 24. 3. and conſequently had his production in that manner, being (as another wiſe Man alſo ſpeaketh of him, under the name aforeſaid) *a Vapor of the Power of God, and a ſincere Emanation* (or, *efflux*) *of the Glory of the Almighty*, *Wiſd. Solom.* Chap 7. 25. To which accordeth that of *Elihu*, Job 33. 4. *The Spirit of God hath made me, and the Breath of the Almighty hath given me Life*. Where (after the manner of the *Hebrews*) the ſame thing is repeated in different words, *the Breath of the Almighty* being put for what had in the former part of the Sentence been called *the Spirit of God*. And me thinks the very Appellation *of the Spirit of God*, doth of it ſelf ſufficiently intimate, that what thoſe two forequoted Writers ſpeak of Wiſdom, is applicable to the Holy Spirit. But theſe things (as I ſaid before) I now omit, enquiring only what are the peculiar Privileges and Operations of the Holy Spirit. His peculiar Privilege therefore is, that he only of all the miniſtring Spirits, being of a more pure and penetrating Nature, and of more intimate admiſſion, is firſt acquainted with the Depths, or profound Secrets of God, as hath been before argued in this very Article, out of 1 *Cor.* 2. 10, 11. where when the Apoſtle ſaith, *Who of Men knoweth the things of a Man, ſave the Spirit of a Man that is in him? Even ſo the things of God knoweth none, ſave the Spirit of God*: the other Member, neceſſary to make the Oppoſition compleat, is to be ſupplied in our Mind, and the place underſtood, as if the Apoſtle had ſaid, *Even ſo the things of God knoweth none of the miniſtring Spirits or Angels, ſave the Spirit of God*; as I before have evinced. Neither let any Man take Offence, whilſt I intimate the Holy Spirit to be an Angel; for tho he were not expreſly ſo called in the Scripture, (as I verily believe he is, tho the places are not ſuch as to be altogether free from Cavil) yet is the thing it ſelf, beyond all controverſy, aſcribed to him. For demonſtration, the word *Angel* originally Greek, and the Hebrew *Malak* anſwering thereunto, ſignifieth any Meſſenger whatſoever; but is in Scripture oftentimes appropriated to ſignify a Spirit, or Heavenly Meſſenger. In both which reſpects the Holy Spirit is an Angel; being not only a Meſſenger, but a ſpiritual Meſſenger ſent out of Heaven, as *Peter* teſtifieth, 1 *Pet* 1. 12. As for the peculiar Operations of the Holy Spirit, the firſt is Sanctification, performed by imparting ſpiritual Gifts unto them, whereby they are conſecrated and ſet apart to the Service of God; ſee 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. *But ye are waſhed, but ye are ſanctified, but ye are juſtified in the Name of our Lord Jeſus, and by the Spirit of our God*. By *Sanctification* cannot here be meant, the cleanſing of the *Corinthians* from the filth of their Sins, for that is expreſſed by *waſhing*; but the conſecrating of them to God, by conferring on them ſpiritual Gifts: See alſo 1 *Cor.* 12. 4, 11. *There are diverſities of Gifts, but the ſame Spirit. Now all theſe worketh one and the ſame Spirit, diſtributing to every one as he will*. For tho other good Spirits are alſo employed about the Faithful; *for they are all miniſtring Spirits, ſent out to miniſter*

niſter for their ſakes, that ſhall inherit Salvation, as the Divine Author to the *Hebrews* teſtifieth, Chap. 1. 14. and do not only guard, *by pitching their Tents round about them*, Pſal. 34. 8. but alſo inſpire them, as they propheſy and ſpeak with ſtrange Tongues, (which ſheweth how the Holy Spirit may inſpire divers at the ſame time) ſee 1 *Cor.* 14. 12, 13, 14, 15. *Even ſo ye, forasmuch as ye are zealous of Spirits*, (ſo the Greek hath it, as the Tranſlators themſelves in the Margin confeſs; who not underſtanding the thing it ſelf, did, in the Text for *Spirits*, put *Spiritual Gifts*) *ſeek that you may excel* (Gr. *abound*) *to the edifying of the Church. Wherefore let him that ſpeaketh in an unknown Tongue, pray that he may interpret. For if I pray in an unknown Tongue, my Spirit prayeth, but my Underſtanding* (or *Mind*) *is unfruitful. What is it then? I will pray with the Spirit, and will pray with the Underſtanding alſo: I will ſing with the Spirit, and will ſing with the Underſtanding alſo.* See alſo Ver. 32. *And the Sprits of the Prophets are ſubject to the Prophets.* Behold here in the words which I have cited, there is twice mention made of Spirits in the plural Number, whilſt the Apoſtle diſcourſeth of them that ſpake with ſtrange Tongues, and propheſied. Neither can the *Underſtandings* or *Minds* of the Linguiſts and Prophets be underſtood by thoſe *Spirits*, ſince the Apoſtle, *Verſ.* 14. putteth a manifeſt difference between *the Spirit*, and *the Underſtanding* or *Mind* of him that ſpake in an unknown Tongue. Neither are *ſpiritual Gifts* meant, for they are in Greek called πνευματικὰ, *Spirituals*, 1 Cor. 12. 1. not πνεύματα, *Spirits*. It remaineth therefore that *miniſtring Spirits* are meant, who inſpired the ſeveral Linguiſts and Prophets, and are therefore ſaid to be ſubject to the Prophets, becauſe they could either make uſe of, and utter their Inſpirations, or ſuſpend the uſe of the ſame, by permitting others to ſpeak, inaſmuch as thoſe *Spirits* did not hurry the Prophets ſo violently, as *evil Spirits* are reported to drive falſe Prophets amongſt the Heathen, otherwiſe God, by giving them to the Prophets in the Church, would be the Author of Tumult and Confuſion, but not of Order; whilſt every one that was inſpired at the ſame time with another, was neceſſitated to utter his Inſpiration as well as he. Though other *good Spirits*, (I ſay) are employed about the Faithful, in the exerciſe of Propheſy and ſtrange Tongues, yet the aſſignation and conferring of thoſe Gifts peculiarly belongeth to the Holy Spirit, as the Apoſtle clearly teſtifieth. The ſecond peculiar Operation of the Holy Spirit, is *to give Believers acceſs through Chriſt to the Father*, Eph. 2. 18. For he being *the Spirit of Adoption, doth witneſs to their Spirits that they are the Children of God*, and ſo maketh them *to cry, Abba, Father*, Rom. 8. 15, 16. and conſequently is *the Pledg of their Inheritance*, Eph. 1. 13, 14. (for ſo I before ſhewed that the word ἀῤῥαβὼν in the Gr. ought to be rendred, and not *Earneſt*, as the Engliſh Tranſlators have it). Some other things perhaps there be, as the ordering of matters in the Church, and ſetting of Officers therein, and alſo laying of Burthens upon Chriſtians, (ſee *Act.* 15. 28.) which ſeem to be peculiar to the Holy Spirit above others; yet ſince the Scripture doth not ſay, *that none ſave the Spirit doth theſe things*, or *that one and the ſame Spirit doth them*, I dare not ſo confidently to aſſert them for peculiar Operations of the Holy Spirit, contenting my ſelf with thoſe which the Scripture doth confeſſedly point out for ſuch.

FINIS.

THE

TESTIMONIES

Of { *Irenæus*, *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, } { *Novatianus*, *Theophilus*, *Origen*, }

(Who lived in the two First Centuries after Christ was born, or thereabouts;)

AS ALSO

Of { *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, *Eusebius*, } { *Hillary*, and *Brightman*; }

CONCERNING

That One GOD, and the Persons of the HOLY TRINITY.

Together with *Observations* on the same.

Printed in the Year, 1691.

Iren. lib. 1. adv. Hæreſ. cap. 2. Edit. Pariſ. Anno 1545. ex recenſione Deſiderii Eraſmi Roterodami.

Eccleſia enim per univerſum orbem uſque ad fines terræ ſeminata, & ab Apoſtolis & a diſcipulis eorum accepit eam fidem, quæ eſt in unum Deum, Patrem omnipotentem, qui fecit cœlum & terram, mare & omnia quæ in eis ſunt; & in unum Jeſum Chriſtum Filium Dei, incarnatum pro noſtra ſalute; & in Spiritum ſanctum, qui per Prophetas prædicavit diſpoſitiones Dei, & adventum, & eam quæ eſt ex Virgine generationem, & paſſionem, & reſurrectionem a mortuis, & in carne in cœlos aſcenſionem dilecti Jeſu Chriſti Domini noſtri, & de cœlis in gloria Patris adventum ejus, ad recapitulanda univerſa, & reſuſcitandam omnem carnem humani generis, ut Chriſto Jeſu Domino noſtro, & Deo, & Salvatori, & Regi, ſecundum placitum Patris inviſibilis omne genu curvetur, cœleſtium, terreſtrium, & infernorum, & omnis lingua confiteatur ei, & judicium juſtum in omnibus faciat. Spiritualia quidem nequitiæ, & Angelos tranſgreſſos, atque apoſtatas factos, & impios, & injuſtos, & blaſphemos homines in æternum ignem mittat. Juſtis autem & æquis & Præcepta ejus ſervantibus, & in dilectione ejus perſeverantibus, quibuſdam quidem ab initio, quibuſdam autem ex pœnitentia, vitam donans, incorruptelam loco muneris conferat, & clavitatem æternam circumdit.

That is,

The Church diſperſed through the whole World, even to the ends of the Earth, hath, both from the Apoſtles and their Diſciples, received that Faith, which is in one God the Father Almighty, which made Heaven and Earth, the Sea, and all the things which are in them; and in one Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God, incarnated for our Salvation; and in one Holy Spirit, who by the Prophets publiſhed the Diſpenſations of God, and the coming, and that Generation which is of the Virgin, and the Paſſion, and the Reſurrection from the Dead, and the Aſcenſion into the Heavens in Fleſh, of the beloved Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, and his coming from Heaven in the Glory of the Father, to gather all things into one, and raiſe up all Fleſh of Mankind, that to Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, and God, and Saviour, and King, according to the good-pleaſure of the Inviſible Father, every knee may bow, of heavenly, earthly, and infernal things, and every Tongue may confeſs to him, and that he may do juſt Judgment in all things. That he may ſend the ſpiritual things of Wickedneſs, and the Angels who have tranſgreſſed and become Apoſtates, and impious, and unjuſt, and unrighteous, and blaſphemous Men, into Eternal Fire: But to the Juſt, and Righteous, and to thoſe that keep his Commandments, and perſevere in his Love, ſome from the beginning, others after Repentance, giving Life, he may, by way of Reward, confer on them Incorruptibility, and encompaſs them with everlaſting ſplendor.

Lib. 1. adverſ. Hæreſ. Cap. 19.

Cum teneamus autem nos regulam veritatis, id eſt, quia ſit unus Deus omnipotens, qui omnia condidit per verbum ſuum, & aptavit, & fecit ex eo quod non erat ad hoc ut ſint omnia, quemadmodum Scriptura dicit, Verbo enim Domini cœli firmati ſunt, & ſpiritu oris ejus omnis virtus eorum. Et iterum: Omnia per ipſum facta ſunt, & ſine ipſo factum eſt nihil. Ex omnibus autem nihil ſubtractum eſt, ſed omnia per ipſum fecit Pater, ſive viſibilia, ſive inviſibilia, ſive ſenſibilia, ſive intelligibilia, ſive temporalia, propter quandam diſpoſitionem; ſive ſempiterna: & ea omnia, non per Angelos, neque per Virtutes aliquas abſciſſas ab ejus ſententia, nihil enim indiget omnium Deus, ſed per Verbum & Spiritum ſuum omnia faciens, & diſponens, & gubernans, & omnibus eſſe præſtans. Hic qui mundum fecit, etenim mundus ex omnibus; hic qui hominem plaſmavit; hic qui Deus Abraham, Deus Iſaac, & Deus Jacob, ſuper quem alius Deus non eſt, neque initium, neque virtus, neque pleroma: Hic Pater Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, quemadmodum oſtendimus.

That is,

Foraſmuch as we hold the Rule of Truth, namely, that there is one God Almighty, who created all things by his Word, and fitted them; and of that which was not, cauſed all things to be, as the Scripture ſaith, *By the Word of the Lord were the Heavens eſtabliſhed; and all their Hoſt by the Breath of his Mouth.* And again; *All things were made by him, and without him was nothing made that was made.* Now from *all* nothing is ſubtracted, but the Father made all things by him; whether viſible, or inviſible; whether ſenſible, or intelligible; whether temporal for a certain Diſpenſation, or eternal: and all thoſe things, not by Angels, nor by Powers, ſundered from his Judgment; for God ſtandeth in no need of all things, but by his Word and Spirit, making, and diſpoſing, and governing all things, and giving all things a Being. This very One that made the World, for the World conſiſts of all things; this very One who formed Man; this very One, who is the God of *Abraham*, the God of *Iſaac*, and the God of *Jacob*, above whom there is no other God, nor Beginning, nor Power, nor Plentitude: This very One is the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, as we will ſhew.

Lib. 2. Cap. 49.

Siquis exquirat cauſam, propter quam in omnibus Pater communicans Filio, ſolus ſcire & horam & diem Domino manifeſtatus eſt, neque aptabilem magis, neque decentiorem, nec ſine periculo alteram, quam hanc inveniat in præſenti, quoniam cum ſolus verax Magiſter eſt Dominus, ut diſcamus per ipſum, ſuper omnia eſſe Patrem. Etenim Pater, ait, major me eſt, & ſecundum agnitionem itaque præpoſitus eſſe Pater annunciatus eſt à Domino noſtro, ad hoc ut & nos, in quantum in figura hujus mundi ſumus, perfectam ſcientiam & tales quæſtiones concedamus Deo: utne ſorte quærentes altitudinem Patris inveſtigare, in tantum periculum incidamus, uti queramus, an ſuper Deum alter ſit Deus.

That is,

If any one ſeek out the Cauſe, why the Father communicating in all things with the Son, is alone manifeſted by the Lord to know the Day and Hour, (*namely, of Judgment*) he ſhall at preſent find none more applicable, nor more beſeeming, nor without danger, than this, That ſince the Lord is the only Truth-ſpeaking Maſter, we ſhould by him learn, THAT THE FATHER IS ABOVE ALL THINGS. For *the Father*, ſaith he, *is greater than I:* Wherefore in Knowledg alſo, the Father is declared by our Lord to have the pre-eminence; to the end, that we alſo, in as much as we are in the Figure of this World, ſhould yield perfect Knowledg, and ſuch Queſtions unto God; and leſt haply ſeeking to find out the height of the Father, we fall into ſo great danger, as to enquire, whether there be another God above God.

Lib.

Lib. 3. Cap. 3.

Sub hoc igitur Clemente, diſſenſione non modica inter eos qui Corinthi eſſent fratres facta, ſcripſit quæ eſt Romæ Eccleſia potentiſſimas literas Corinthiis, ad pacem eos congregans, & reparans fidem eorum, & annuncians quam in recenti ab Apoſtolis receperant Traditionem, annunciantem unum Deum omnipotentem, factorem cœli & terræ, plaſmatorem hominis, qui induxerit cataclyſmum, & advocaverit Abraham, qui eduxerit Populum de terra Egypti, qui collocutus ſit Moyſi, qui legem diſpoſuerit & Prophetas miſerit, qui ignem præparaverit Diabolo & Angelis ejus. Hunc Patrem Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti ab Eccleſiis annunciari, ex ipſa Scriptura qui velint, diſcere poſſint, & Apoſtolicam Eccleſiæ Traditionem intelligere, cum ſit vetuſtior epiſtola his qui nunc falsò docent, & alterum Deum ſuper Demiurgum & factorem horum omnium quæ ſunt commentiuntur.

That is,

In the time of this *Clement*, a great Diſſention ariſing amongſt the Brethren that were at *Corinth*, the Church that is at *Rome* wrote moſt powerful Letters to the *Corinthians*, drawing them together unto Peace, and repairing their Faith, and declaring the Tradition which they had newly received from the Apoſtles, which Tradition declares one God Almighty, maker of Heaven and Earth, former of Man; who brought the Flood, and called *Abraham*; who led the People out of *Egypt*; who talked with *Moſes*; who diſpenſed the Law, and ſent the Prophets; who prepared Fire for the Devil and his Angels. That he is by the Church declared the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. They who have a deſire, may learn, from the Writing it ſelf, and underſtand the Apoſtolick Tradition of the Church, in that the Epiſtle is ancienter than they who now teach falſly, and withal feign another God above the Contriver and maker of all theſe things that are.

Lib. 3. Cap. 6.

Neque igitur Dominus, neque Spiritus Sanctus, neque Apoſtoli tum qui non eſſet Deus, definitivè & abſolutè Deum nominaſſent aliquando, niſi eſſet verus Deus: neque Dominum appellaſſent aliquam ſuæ perſonæ, niſi qui dominatur omnium Deum Patrum & filium ejus, qui Dominium accepit à Patre ſuo omnis conſtitutionis. ——— Nemo igitur alius, quemadmodum prædixi, Deus nominatur, aut Dominus appellatur, niſi qui eſt omnium Deus & Dominus, qui & Moyſi dixit: Ego ſum, qui ſum: & ſic dices filiis Iſrael: Qui eſt, miſit me ad vos: & hujus Filius Jeſus Chriſtus Dominus noſter, qui filios Dei facit Credentes in nomen ſuum.

That is,

Wherefore neither the Lord, nor the Holy Spirit, nor the Apoſtles, would definitively and abſolutely, at any time, have named him God, who was not God, unleſs he were the true God: Neither would they have called any one of his own Perſon Lord, but him that exerciſeth Lordſhip over all, even God the Father, and his Son, who hath received from his Father the Lordſhip of all the Creation. ——— No other therefore, as I ſaid before, is named God, or called Lord, but he that is the God and Lord of all, who alſo ſaid to *Moſes*, *I am that I am: and thus ſhalt thou ſay to the Children of* Iſrael, *He that Is, ſent me unto you:* and his Son Jeſus Chriſt.

Ibid.

Et ego igitur invoco te Domine Deus Abraham, & Deus Iſaac, & Deus Jacob qui eſt & Iſrael, Pater Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti Deus qui per multitudinem miſericordiæ tuæ & bene ſenſiſti in nobis, ut te cognoſcamus, qui feciſti cœlum & terram & dominaris omnium, qui es ſolus & verus Deus, ſuper quem alius Deus non eſt, præter Dominum noſtrum Jeſum Chriſtum dominatione quoque dominavis Spiritus Sancti, da omni legenti hanc Scripturam cognoſcere te, quia ſolus Deus es, & confirmari in te, & abſiſtere ab omni hæretica, & quæ eſt ſine Deo & impia ſententia.

That

That is,

And I therefore invocate thee, O Lord, the God of *Abraham*, the God of *Isaac*, and the God of *Jacob*, who is also *Israel*, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; the God, who through the multitude of thy Mercy hast taken pleasure in us, that we may know thee, who hast made the Heaven and Earth, and ruleſt over all; who art the only and true God, above whom there is no other God; doſt, in domination, beſides our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, rule alſo over the Holy Spirit, grant to every one that readeth this Writing to know thee, that thou art the only God, and to be confirmed in thee, and to depart from every Heretical and Atheiſtical, and impious Opinion.

Lib. 3. Cap. 9.

Oſtenſo igitur ſic plane, & adhuc oſtendatur manifeſtius neminem alterum Dominum vel Deum, neque Prophetas, neque Apoſtolos, neque Dominum, Chriſtum confeſſum eſſe ex ſua perſona, ſed præcipue Deum & Dominum, Prophetis quidem & Apoſtolis Patrem & Filium confitentibus, alterum autem neminem neque Deum nominantibus, neque Dominum confitentibus. Et ipſo Domino Patrem tantum Deum & Dominum eum, qui ſolus eſt Deus & Dominator omnium, tradente Diſcipulis ſequi nos oportet, ſiquidem illorum ſumus Diſcipuli, teſtimonia illorum ita ſe habentia.

That is,

It being therefore thus plainly ſhewn, let it alſo be ſhewn yet more manifeſtly, that neither the Prophets, nor the Apoſtles, nor the Lord Chriſt, confeſſed any other to be of his own Perſon Lord or God, but chiefly the Prophets and Apoſtles confeſſing the Father and the Son to be God and Lord, but neither naming any other God, nor confeſſing him to be Lord. And the Lord himſelf delivering to the Diſciples, that the Father only is that God and Lord, who is the only God and Ruler of all, we ought to follow, if we be their Diſciples, their Teſtimonies running in this ſtrain.

[This Paſſage, as well as the laſt ſave one, before quoted, clearly intimateth that even in the Judgment of *Irenæus*, others beſides the Father and the Son are ſometimes in the Scripture ſimply called *GOD* and *LORD*; but then they are not ſo called according to their own Perſons. Whereunto accordeth that of the Scripture it ſelf, *Exod.* 23. 20, 21. where the LORD ſpeaketh thus, *Behold, I ſend an Angel before thee to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his Voice, provoke him not: for he will not pardon your Tranſgreſſions; for MY NAME IS IN HIM.* From whence it is apparent, that when an Angel is at any time called GOD or LORD, as amongſt other places it cometh to paſs, *Exod.* 3. 2, 4, 6. *Exod.* 14. 19, 24, 26. *Judg.* 6. 12, 14, 16, 19, 20. The reaſon of this is, not becauſe that Angel is *a ſeveral Subſiſtence in God*, or, *an Uncreated Angel*, (as the Adverſaries are pleaſed, out of their own Imagination, to phraſe it) but becauſe *the Name of GOD or the LORD is in him*; and he accordingly denominated, not from his own Perſon, but from that of GOD or LORD which he ſuſtaineth.]

Lib. 4. Cap. 1.

Cum ſit igitur hoc firmum & conſtans neminem alterum Deum & Dominum à Spiritu prædicatum, niſi eum qui dominatur omnium Deus cum verbo ſuo, & eos qui adoptionis Spiritum accipiunt, hoc eſt eos qui credant in unum verum Deum, & Chriſtum Jeſum filium Dei, ſimiliter & Apoſtolos neminem alium à ſemetipſis Deum appellaſſe, aut Dominum cognoviſſe, multo autem magis Dominam, qui & nobis præcepit neminem Patrem confiteri, niſi eum qui eſt in cœlis, qui eſt noſter Deus, & noſter Pater: manifeſte falſa oſtendantur ea, quæ dicunt circumventores, & perverſiſſimi Sophiſtæ.

That is,

For as much therefore as this is firm and conſtant, that no other God and Lord was publiſhed by the Spirit, but he that ruleth over all, even God with his Word, and they who

who receive the Spirit of Adoption, that is, they that believe in that one and true God, and Christ Jesus the Son of God; and that the Apostles in like manner did of themselves call no other God, or know him to be Lord; but that the Lord much more, who also injoyned us to confess no Father, but him that is in Heaven, which is that one God, and one Father: those things are shewn to be manifestly false, which Deceivers and most perverse Sophisters affirm.

[These Passages which we have cited out of this ancient Writer *Irenæus*, most evidently shew that he firmly believed the Father only to be that one God, the God of *Abraham*, the God of *Isaac*, and the God of *Jacob*; and his Son Jesus Christ (whom otherwise he supposeth to have had a Being before his Birth of the Virgin, but how oppositely to the very thing it self, and the Tenour of the Scripture, I have above sufficiently argued) to be that one Lord who received his Dominion from God the Father, and the Holy Spirit to be neither that one God, nor that one Lord. So that had he not failed in imagining two Natures in Christ, he had exactly hit the Doctrine of the HOLY TRINITY delivered in the Scripture.]

Justinus Martyr Opera

Frederici Sylburgii editus, Anno 1593.

Apolog. 2. Pag. 43.

Ἐνθένδε καὶ ἄθεοι κεκλήμεθα, καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν τῶν τοιούτων νομιζομένων Θεῶν (δαιμόνων) ἄθεοι εἶναι. ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τοῦ ἀληθεστάτου, καὶ πατρὸς δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν, ἀνεπιμίκτου τε κακίας Θεοῦ· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνόν τε, καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ υἱὸν ἐλθόντα καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα, καὶ τὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἑπομένων καὶ ἐξομοιουμένων ἀγαθῶν ἀγγέλων στρατὸν, πνεῦμά τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν, λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τιμῶντες, καὶ παντὶ βουλομένῳ μαθεῖν, ἀφθόνως παραδιδόντες.

That is,

Hence also are we called Atheists, and we confess our selves to be Atheists in reference to such reputed Gods (Demons) but not to that most true God, who is the Father of all Righteousness and Temperance, and the other Vertues, and unstained with any Evil; for him and the Son that came from him, and taught us these things, and the Host of the other good Angels who accompany and resemble him, together with the Prophetick Spirit, we adore and worship, in word and truth honouring them, and freely imparting, according as we have been taught, to every one that is willing to learn.

[This Passage sheweth how soon Christians began to commit Idolatry in worshipping Angels.]

Ibid. pag. 45, 47.

Ἄθεοι μὲν οὖν ὡς οὐκ ἐσμὲν, τὸν δημιουργὸν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς σεβόμενοι, ἀνενδεῆ αἱμάτων καὶ σπονδῶν καὶ θυμιαμάτων, ὡς ἐδιδάχθημεν, λέγοντες, λόγῳ εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας ἐφ' οἷς προσφερόμεθα πᾶσιν, ὅσῃ δύναμις αἰνοῦντες, τίς σωφρονῶν οὐχ ὁμολογήσει; τὸν διδάσκαλόν τε τούτων γενόμενον ἡμῖν, καὶ εἰς τοῦτο γεννηθέντα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν σταυρωθέντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, τοῦ γενομένου ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐπὶ χρόνοις Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἐπιτρόπου, υἱὸν αὐτοῦ

τοῦ

τῶν ὄντως Θεοῦ μαθόντες, καὶ ἐν δευτέρᾳ χώρᾳ ἔχοντες, πνεῦμά τε προφητικὸν ἐν τρίτῃ τάξει, ὅτι μετὰ λόγου τιμῶμεν, ἀποδείξομεν. Ἐνταῦθα γὰρ μανίαν ἡμῶν καταφαίνονται, δευτέραν χώραν μετὰ τὸν ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀεὶ ὄντα Θεὸν, καὶ γεννήτορα τῶν ἁπάντων, ἀνθρώπῳ σταυρωθέντι διδόναι ἡμᾶς λέγοντες· ἀγνοοῦντες τὸ ἐν τούτῳ μυστήριον, ᾧ προσέχειν ὑμᾶς ἐξηγουμένων ἡμῶν προτρεπόμεθα.

That is,

Wherefore that we are not Atheists, whilst we worship the Maker of this Universe, saying (as we have been taught) that he needeth not Blood, Drink-offerings, and Incense, and according to the utmost of our Power, praising him with the word of Prayer and Thanksgiving for all the Food which we take, what sober Man will not confess? And that we do with Reason honour him that taught us these things, and was therefore born (even Jesus Christ, who was crucified under *Pontius Pilate*, the Deputy of *Judea* in the Times of *Tiberius Cæsar*,) having learn'd that he was the Son of the true God, and *accounting him in the second rank, and the Prophetick Spirit in the third order*, we will demonstrate. For upon this account they charge us with Madness, saying that we give the second rank after the Immutable and Eternal God, who produced all things, to a crucified Man: not knowing the Mystery that lieth herein, to which we beseech you to give Attention whilst we unfold it.

Ibid. Pag. 57.

Ἡ δὲ πρώτη δύναμις μετὰ τὸν πατέρα πάντων καὶ δεσπότην Θεὸν, καὶ υἱὸς, ὁ Λόγος ἐστὶν· ὃς τίνα τρόπον σαρκοποιηθεὶς ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν, ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς ἐρῶμεν.

That is,

Now after God the Father and Lord of all things, the Prime Power, and Son, is the Word. And in what manner being made Flesh he became a Man, we will hereafter declare.

Ibid. Pag. 72, 73.

Ἵνα δὲ καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἡμετέρων διδασκάλων (λέγομεν δὲ τὸν λόγον τὸν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν) λαβόντα τὸν Πλάτωνα μάθητε τὸ εἰπεῖν, ὕλην ἄμορφον ὅσαν στρέψαντα τὸν Θεὸν κόσμον ποιῆσαι, ἀκούσατε τῶν αὐτολεξεὶ εἰρημένων διὰ Μωσέως τῶν προδεδηλωμένου πρώτου προφήτου, καὶ πρεσβυτέρου τῶν ἐν Ἕλλησι συγγραφέων· δι' οὗ μηνύον τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα πῶς τὴν ἀρχὴν, καὶ ἐκ τίνων ἐδημιούργησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ἔφη οὕτως· Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν· ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος, καὶ σκότος ἐπάνω τῆς ἀβύσσου· καὶ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τῶν ὑδάτων· καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Θεὸς, γενηθήτω φῶς· καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως. Ὥστε λόγῳ Θεοῦ ἐκ τῶν ὑποκειμένων καὶ προδηλωθέντων διὰ Μωσέως, γεγενῆσθαι τὸν πάντα κόσμον, καὶ Πλάτων, καὶ οἱ ταὐτὰ λέγοντες, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐμάθομεν, καὶ ἡμεῖς πεισθῆναι δύνασθε. Καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ παρὰ Πλάτωνι Τιμαίῳ φυσιολογούμενον περὶ τῶν υἱοῦ τῶν Θεοῦ, ὅτε λέγει, Ἐχίασεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ παντὶ, παρὰ Μωσέως λαβὼν ὁμοίως εἶπεν. Ἐν γὰρ ταῖς Μωσέως γραφαῖς ἀναγέγραπται, ὡς κατ' ἐκεῖνο τὸν καιροῦ ὅτε ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ Αἰγύπτου οἱ Ἰσραηλῖται, καὶ γεγόνασιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ἀπήντησαν αὐτοῖς ἰοβόλα θηρία, ἔχιδναί τε καὶ ἀσπίδες, καὶ ὄφεων πᾶν γένος, ὃ ἐδανάτου τὸν λαὸν· καὶ κατ' ἐπίπνοιαν καὶ ἐνέργειαν τὴν παρὰ τῶν Θεοῦ λεγομένην, λαβεῖν τὸν Μωσέα χαλκὸν, καὶ ποιῆσαι τύπον σταυροῦ, καὶ τοῦτο στῆσαι ἐπὶ τῇ ἁγίᾳ σκηνῇ, καὶ εἰπεῖν τῷ λαῷ, Ἐὰν προσβλέπητε τῷ τύπῳ τούτῳ, καὶ πιστεύητε, ἐν αὐτῷ σωθήσεσθε. Καὶ γενομένου τούτου, τοὺς μὲν ὄφεις ἀποθανεῖν ἀνεγράψε· τὸν δὲ λαὸν ἐκφυγεῖν τὸν θάνατον. Οὕτως παρέδωκεν ἀναγνοὺς Πλάτων, καὶ μὴ ἀκριβῶς ἐπιστάμενος, μηδὲ νοήσας τύπον εἶναι σταυροῦ, ἀλλὰ χίασμα νοήσας, τὴν μετὰ τὸν πρῶτον Θεὸν δύναμιν κεχιάσθαι ἐν τῷ παντὶ εἶπε. Καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν τρίτον ἐπειδὴ, ὡς προείπομεν, ἐπάνω τῶν ὑδάτων ἀνέγνω ὑπὸ Μωσέως εἰρημένον ἐπιφέρεσθαι τὸ τῶν Θεοῦ πνεῦμα. Δευτέραν μὲν γὰρ χώραν τῷ παρὰ Θεοῦ Λόγῳ, ὃν κεχιάσθαι ἐν τῷ παντὶ ἔφη, δίδωσι· τὴν δὲ τρίτην,

τῷ

τῷ λεχθέντι ὀπιφέρεσθαι τῷ ὕδατι πνεύματι, εἴπων· Τὰ δὲ τρίτα περὶ τὸν τρίτον.

That is,

But that ye may understand that *Plato* received from our Teachers, (we mean the Word by the Prophets) what he said of God, as that having altered the shapeless Matter, he made the World; hear the very words of *Moses*, who was before declared to be the first Prophet, and older than the Greek Writers: by whom the Prophetick Spirit signifying how at first, and of what materials God framed the World, spake thus: *In the beginning God made the Heaven and the Earth. Now the Earth was invisible and incomposed, and Darkness was upon the Abyss, and the Spirit of God was carried upon the Waters. And God said, Let there be Light, and it was so.* Wherefore by the Word of God was the whole World made of the Materials foresignified by *Moses*, as *Plato*, and others of his Opinion; and we also understand, and ye may assent thereunto. And that Natural Discourse touching the Son of God in *Plato's Timæus*, when he saith, *He made him a Saltier* (or, *Greek X*) *in the Universe*, he likewise received from *Moses*, and uttered. For in the Writings of *Moses* it is recorded, how that when the Israelites departed out of *Egypt*, and came into the Wilderness, venomous Beasts met them, both Vipers, and Asps, and every sort of Serpents, and so killed the People. Whereupon, by Divine Instinct and Efficacy, *Moses* took Brass, and made the form of a Cross, and set it over the Tabernacle, saying to the People, If ye look upon this form, and believe, ye shall be saved thereby. And when this was done, he writeth, that the Serpents died, but the People escaped Death. Thus did *Plato* deliver it, after he had read the Story; and not accurately knowing nor conceiving that it was the form of a Cross, but thinking on a Saltier, he said, that the Power next to the Prime God was made a Saltier (or, Greek *X*) in the Universe. He was also beholden to *Moses* for what he Spake of the Third; for, as we spake before, he read it recorded by *Moses*, that the Spirit of God was carried upon the Waters. For he giveth the second rank to the Word that is from God, and who, as he said, was made a Saltier in the Universe; but the third Rank to the Spirit, which was said to have been carried on the Water, whilest he saith, *The third things are about the Third.*

Colloq. cum Tryphone Judæo, Pag 207.

Ἤδη μὲν τοι, ὦ τρύφων, εἶπον, οὐκ ἀπόλλυται τὸ τοιοῦτον εἶναι Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐὰν ἀποδεῖξαι μὴ δύνωμαι ὅτι καὶ προϋπῆρχεν υἱὸς τοῦ ποιητοῦ τῶν ὅλων Θεὸς ὤν, καὶ γεγένηται ἄνθρωπος διὰ τὸν παρθένου, ἀλλὰ ἐκ παντὸς ἀποδεικνυμένου ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅστις οὗτος ἔσται. Ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀποδεικνύω ὅτι προϋπῆρχε, καὶ γεννεθῆναι ἄνθρωπος ὁμοιοπαθὴς ἡμῖν, σάρκα ἔχων, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς βουλὴν ὑπέμεινεν, ἐν τούτῳ πυπλανῆσθαί με μόνον λέγειν δίκαιον, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀρνεῖσθαι ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς, ἐὰν φαίνοται ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γεννηθεὶς, καὶ ἐκλογῇ γενόμενος εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι ἀποδεικνύηται. Καὶ γὰρ εἰσί τινες, ὦ φίλοι, ἔλεγον, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡμετέρου γένους ὁμολογοῦντες αὐτὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι, ἄνθρωπον δὲ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γενόμενον ἀποφαινόμενοι· οἷς οὐ συντίθεμαι, οὐδ' ἂν πλεῖστοι ταῦτά μοι δοξάσαντες εἴποιεν, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἀνθρωπείοις διδάγμασι κεκελεύσμεθα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πείθεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τοῖς διὰ τῶν μακαρίων προφητῶν κηρυχθεῖσι καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ διδαχθεῖσι. Καὶ ὁ Τρύφων, Ἐμοὶ μὲν δοκοῦσιν, εἶπεν, οἱ λέγοντες ἄνθρωπον γεγονέναι αὐτὸν, καὶ κατ' ἐκλογὴν κεχρῖσθαι, καὶ Χριστὸν γεγονέναι, πιθανώτερον ὑμῶν λέγειν τῶν ταῦτα ἅπερ φῄς λεγόντων. Καὶ γὰρ πάντες ἡμεῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων προσδοκῶμεν γενήσεσθαι.

That is,

Nevertheless, O *Tryphon*, said I, this remaineth safe, that such a one is the Christ of God, although I cannot demonstrate that he was before the Son of the maker of all things, being a God, and was born a Man by the

Virgin, it being every way demonstrated that he is the Christ of God, whosoever otherwise he shall be found to be. But if I shall not demonstrate that he did pre-exist, and according to the Counsel of the Father endured to be born a Man of like Affections with us, being endued with Flesh, it is just and fit to say that I am mistaken in this only, and not to deny that he is the Christ, if he appear to be a Man born of Men, and to have become the Christ by Election. For there are some, dear Friends, said I, of our kind, who confess him to be the Christ, yet hold him to be a Man, born of Men. To whom I assent not; no, though very many of the same Onion with me should speak it, since we are commanded by Christ himself, not to hearken to the Doctrines of Men, but to such things as have been promulgated by the Prophets of happy Memory, and taught by himself. And *Tryphon* replied, They that say he was a Man, and according to Election anointed and made Christ, methinks speak more probably, than you who say such things as you relate. For all we expect that the Christ shall be a Man of Men.

[Observe here, Christian Reader, 1. That *Justin Martyr* did not think it inconsistent that Jesus should be the Christ, although he had no other than a Humane Nature. Secondly, That divers Christians, whom *Justin* himself owned for such; for he saith, that they were of the same kind and opinion with him, did then, *de facto*, affirm, that Jesus, whom they counted the Christ, had none but a Humane Nature. Both which were in the succeeding Age by *Athanasius*, and since by other like furious Zealots, stifly denied, and he pronounced utterly incapable of eternal Life, who should not believe, not only that Christ had another Nature, besides his Humane Nature, but (what neither *Justin Martyr*, nor any other of the Christians, who lived in the two first Centuries, and whose Works are extant, ever did affirm) that that other Nature was the very Nature of the most High God. Thirdly, That the Jews (who would be happy, were their Opinion, concerning the Kingdom of Christ, as true as that which they hold concerning his Nature) did not believe that the Christ, who was to come, should be other than a Man.]

Ibid. Pag. 212, 213.

Τὰ νῦν δὲ ἤδη ἀναλαβὼν τὸν λόγον, ἀπόδειξον ἡμῖν ὅτι ἕτερος Θεὸς παρὰ τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων ὑπὸ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος ὡμολόγηται εἶναι — Μωσῆς οὖν ὁ μακάριος καὶ πιστὸς θεράπων Θεοῦ, μηνύων ὅτι ὁ ὀφθεὶς τῷ Ἀβραὰμ πρὸς τῇ δρυῒ τῇ Μαμβρῇ Θεὸς, σὺν τοῖς ἅμα αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν Σοδόμων κρίσιν πεμφθεῖσι δύο ἀγγέλοις ὑπὸ ἄλλου τοῦ ἐν ὑπουρανίοις ἀεὶ μένοντος, καὶ οὐδενὶ ὀφθέντος, ἢ ὁμιλήσαντος δι' ἑαυτοῦ ποτὲ, ὃν ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων καὶ πατέρα νοοῦμεν.

That is,

But now resuming the Discourse, demonstrate to us that there is another God by the Prophetick Spirit confessed to be, besides the Maker of all things. — *Moses* the happy and faithful Servant of God, intimateth that it was a God that appeared to *Abraham* at the Oke of *Mamre*, together with the other two Angels sent with him to the judgment of *Sodom*, by another that perpetually abideth in the Heavenly Places, and never appeared or discoursed with any one by himself, whom we conceive the Maker and Father of all Things.

Ibid. pag. 215.

Κἀγὼ πάλιν εἶπον, Ἐπὶ τὰς γραφὰς ἐπανελθὼν, πειράσομαι πεῖσαι ὑμᾶς. ὅτι οὗτος ὅ, τε τῷ Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ τῷ Ἰακὼβ, καὶ τῷ Μωσεῖ ὤφθαι λεγόμενος καὶ γεγραμμένος Θεὸς, ἕτερός ἐστι τοῦ τὰ πάντα ποιήσαντος Θεοῦ, ἀριθμῷ λέγω, ἀλλὰ οὐ γνώμη, οὐδὲν γὰρ φημι αὐτὸν πεπραχέναι ποτὲ ἢ ἅπερ αὐτὸς ὁ τὸν κόσμον ποιήσας, ὑπὲρ ὃν ἄλλο οὐκ ἔστι Θεὸς, βεβούληται καὶ πρᾶξαι καὶ ὁμιλῆσαι.

That

That is,

And I ſaid again, I will return to the Scriptures, and endeavour to perſwade you, that that God which is ſaid and recorded to have appeared to *Abraham*, *Jacob*, and *Moſes*, is another than the God that made all things, in Number, I ſay, not Opinion; for, I ſay, he never did any thing, but what he that made the World, above whom there is no other God, did will that he ſhould do and diſcourſe.

Ibid. pag. 218.

Κἀγὼ, ὑπὸ Μωσέως, ὦ ἀδελφοὶ, πάλιν γέγραπται, ἔλεγον, ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ὀφθεὶς τοῖς πατριάρχαις λεγόμενος Θεὸς, καὶ ἄγγελος καὶ κύριος λέγεται, ἵνα καὶ ἐκ τούτου ἐπιγνῶτε αὐτὸν ὑπερετοῦντα τῷ τῶν ὅλων πατρί.

That is,

And I ſaid, It is again writteu by *Moſes*, O Brethren, that he who appeared to the Patriarks, called a *God*, is alſo called an *Angel*, and *Lord*; that you may from thence know that he miniſtred to the Father of all Things.

Pag. 220.

Καὶ ὁ Τρύφων, οὐ τοῦτο νοούμενα ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τῶν προλελεγμένων, ἔλεγεν, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἄγγελος μὲν ἦν ὁ ὀφθεὶς ἐν φλογῖ πυρὸς, Θεὸς δὲ ὁ ὁμιλῶν τῷ Μωσεῖ. Ὅστε καὶ ἄγγελον καὶ Θεὸν, δύο ὁμοῦ ὄντας, ἐν τῇ τότε ὀπτασίᾳ γεγενῆσθαι. Κἀγὼ πάλιν ἀπεκρινάμην, Εἰ καὶ τοῦτο γέγονε τότε, ὦ φίλοι, ὡς καὶ ἄγγελον καὶ Θεὸν ὁμοῦ ἐν τῇ ὀπτασίᾳ τῇ τῷ Μωσεῖ γενομένῃ ὑπάρξαι, ὡς καὶ ἀποδέδεικται ὑμῖν διὰ τῶν προγεγραμμένων λόγων, οὐχ ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων ἔσται Θεὸς ὁ τῷ Μωσεῖ εἰπὼν αὐτὸν εἶναι Θεὸν Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ Θεὸν Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Θεὸν Ἰακὼβ, ἀλλ' ὁ ἀποδεικθεὶς ὑμῖν ὦφθαι τῷ Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ τῷ Ἰακὼβ, τῇ τῶν ποιητοῦ τῶν ὅλων θελήσει ὑπηρετῶν, καὶ ἐν τῇ κρίσι τῶν Σοδόμων τῇ βουλῇ αὐτοῦ ὁμοίως ὑπηρετήσας. ὥστε κἂν, ὥς φατε, ἔχῃ, ὅτι δύο ἦσαν, καὶ ἄγγελος καὶ Θεὸς, οὐ τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων καὶ πατέρα καταλιπόντα τὰ ὑπὲρ οὐρανὸν ἅπαντα, ἐν ὀλίγῳ γῆς μορίῳ πεφάνθαι πᾶς ὁστισοῦν, κἂν μικρὸν νοῦν ἔχων, τολμήσει εἰπεῖν.

That is,

And *Tryphon* ſaid, We do not underſtand this from the forecited words, but that it was an Angel that appeared in the flame of Fire, but God that ſpake to *Moſes*. So that both an Angel and God, were together in the Viſion. And I replied, Although it ſo then happened, O Friends, that both an Angel and God were together in the Viſion preſented to *Moſes*, yet as it hath been demonſtrated to you by the fore-written words, it will not be God the Maker of all things, who ſaid to *Moſes*, that he was the God of *Abraham*, the God of *Iſaac*, and the God of *Jacob*, but he whom we before demonſtrated to have appeared unto *Abraham*, and to *Jacob*, MINISTRING to the Will of the Maker of all things, and who in the Judgment of *Sodom* did in like manner MINISTER to his Will. So that although it were as you ſay, that they were twain, even an Angel and God, yet none whoſoever, though of mean underſtanding, will dare to ſay, that the Maker and Father of the Univerſe, having left all the things that are above the Heaven, did appear in a ſmall parcel of the Earth.

Ibid. Pag. 221.

Μαρτύριον δὲ καὶ ἄλλο ὑμῖν, ὦ φίλοι, ἔφην, ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν δώσω, ὅτι ἀρχὴν πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων ὁ Θεὸς γεγένηκε δύναμίν τινα ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ λογικὴν, ἥτις καὶ Δόξα κυρίου ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου καλεῖται, ποτὲ δὲ Θεὸς, ποτὲ δὲ κύριος καὶ λόγος· ποτὲ δὲ ἀρκιστράτηγον ἑαυτὸν λέγει, ἐν ἀνθρώπου μορφῇ φανέντα τῷ τοῦ Ναυῆ Ἰησοῦ· ἔκειν γὰρ πάντα προσονομάζεσθαι, ἔκ τε τοῦ ὑπηρετεῖν τῷ πατρικῷ βουλήματι, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν πατρὸς θελήσει γεγενῆσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐ (theſe two words ſeem ſuperfluous, for they marr the ſenſe)

τοιοῦτον ὁποῖον καὶ ἐφ' ἡμῶν γενόμενον ὁρῶμεν. Λόγον γὰρ τινα προβάλλοντες, λόγον γεννῶμεν οὐ κατ' ἀποτομὴν, ὡς ἐλαττωθῆναι τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν λόγον, προβαλλόμενοι. Καὶ ὁποῖον ἐπὶ πυρὸς ὁρῶμεν ἄλλο γινόμενον, οὐκ ἐλαττούμενου ἐκείνου ἐξ οὗ ἡ ἄναψις γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ μένοντος, καὶ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀναφθὲν, καὶ αὐτὸ ὂν φαίνεται, οὐκ ἐλαττῶσαν ἐκεῖνο ἐξ οὗ ἀνήφθη. Μαρτυρήσει δέ μοι ὁ λόγος τῆς Σοφίας, αὐτὸς ὢν οὗτος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων γεννηθεὶς, καὶ λόγος καὶ σοφία, καὶ δύναμις, καὶ δόξα τοῦ γεννήσαντος ὑπάρχων, καὶ διὰ Σολομῶνος φήσαντος ταῦτα. Ἐὰν ἀναγγείλω ὑμῖν τὰ καθ' ἡμέραν γενόμενα, μνημονεύσω ἀριθμῆσαι. Κύριος ἔκτισέμε ἀρχὴν, ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ, κλ.

That is,

Friends, said I, I will produce you another Testimony out of the Scriptures, that God in the beginning before all the Creatures, generated of himself a certain Rational Power, which is by the Holy Spirit called also *the Glory of the Lord*, another while *the Son*, another while *Wisdom*, another while *an Angel*, another while *God*, *another while Lord* and *Word*, another while he calleth himself *chief Captain*, appearing to Jesus the Son of *Naue* in the form of a Man. For he may be called by all these Names, both because he MINISTRETH to the Will of the Father, and was VOLUNTARILY begotten of the Father, as we see it come to pass even in our selves. For uttering a certain word, we beget a word, not uttering it by an abscission or cutting off, so that the word within us is diminished. And as we see it come to pass in Fire, that another is produced, without the diminution of that from whence the kindling was made, so that it remaineth in its former state, and what was kindled of it appeareth to exist, without having diminished that, of which it was kindled. My Author is the Word of Wisdom, being that very God generated of the Father of the Universe, and also the Word, and Wisdom, and Power, and Glory of his begetter, and speaketh thus by *Salomon: When I shall have declared unto you daily matters, I will commemorate and reckon up the things of old. The Lord created me in the beginning, his Way unto his Works*, &c.

Ibid. pag. 278.

Εἰ νενοήκατε τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τῶν προφητῶν, οὐκ ἂν ἐξηρνεῖσθε αὐτὸν (Χριστὸν) εἶναι Θεὸν, τοῦ μόνου καὶ ἀγεννήτου καὶ ἀῤῥήτου Θεοῦ υἱόν.

That is,

Had ye understood the things spoken by the Prophets, you would not have denied him (Christ) to be a God, the Son of the ONELY UNBEGOTTEN and UNSPEAKABLE GOD.

Ibid. pag. 279.

Καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς ἀνιστορημένα ἀπὸ τῶν τοῦ Μωϋσέως, καὶ ἐξηγημένα ὑπ' ἐμοῦ πάλιν ἔλεγον, δι' ὧν ἀποδέδεικται ὑπὸ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ τεταγμένος, καὶ ὑπηρετῶν τῇ βουλῇ αὐτοῦ, οὗτος ὃς ὤφθη τῷ τε Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ τῷ Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ τῷ Ἰακὼβ, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις πατριάρχαις ἀναγεγραμμένος Θεὸς.

That is,

And I repeated the things which I had formerly alledged out of the Writings of *Moses*, and explained, whereby he who appeared to *Abraham*, and to *Isaac*, and to *Jacob*, was demonstrated to have been SUBORDINATE to the Father, and the LORD, and to MINISTER unto his Will, and to have been stiled a God by the other Patriarks.

Ibid. p. *eadem*, & p. 280.

Ὅταν μου ὁ Θεὸς λέγῃ, Ἀνέβη ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ Ἀβραάμ· ἢ, Ἐλάλησε Κύριος πρὸς Μωσῆν· καὶ, Κατέβη Κύριος τὸ πύργον ἰδεῖν ὃν ᾠκοδόμησαν οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ἢ ὅτε, Ἔκλεισεν ὁ Θεὸς τὴν κιβωτὸν Νῶε ἔξωθεν· μὴ ἡγεῖσθε αὐτὸν τὸν ἀγέννητον Θεὸν καταβεβηκέναι ἢ ἀνα-

ἀναβεβηκέναι ποθέν· ὁ γὰρ ἄῤῥητος πατὴρ καὶ κύριος τῶν πάντων, οὔτε ποι ἀφῖκται, οὔτε περιπατεῖ, ὅτε καθεύδει, οὔτε ἀνίσταται, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ χώρᾳ ὅπου ποτὲ μένει, ὀξὺ ὁρῶν, καὶ ὀξὺ ἀκούων, οὐκ ὀφθαλμοῖς, οὐδὲ ὠσὶν, ἀλλὰ δυνάμει ἀλέκτῳ καὶ πάντα ἐφορᾷ, καὶ πάντα γινώσκει, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἡμῶν λέληθεν αὐτόν· οὔτε κινούμενος ὁ τόπῳ τε ἀχώρητος, καὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ὅλῳ, ὅς γε ἦν καὶ πρὶν τὸν κόσμον γενέσθαι. πῶς ἂν οὖν οὗτος ἢ λαλήσειε πρὸς τινα, ἢ ὀφθείη τινὶ, ἢ ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ μέρει γῆς φανείη; — Οὔτε οὖν Ἀβραάμ, οὔτε Ἰσαάκ, οὔτε Ἰακὼβ, οὔτε ἄλλος ἀνθρώπων εἶδε τὸν πατέρα καὶ ἄῤῥητον κύριον τῶν πάντων ἁπλῶς, καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν κατὰ βουλὴν τὴν ἐκείνου καὶ Θεὸν ὄντα, υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἄγγελον ἐκ τοῦ ὑπηρετεῖν τῇ γνώμῃ αὐτοῦ· ὃν καὶ ἄνθρωπον γεννηθῆναι διὰ τῆς παρθένου βεβούληται· ὃς καὶ πῦρ ποτὲ γέγονε τῇ πρὸς Μωσέα ὁμιλίᾳ τῇ ἀπὸ τῆς βάτου. Ἐπεὶ ἐὰν μὴ οὕτω νοήσωμεν τὰς γραφὰς, συμβήσεται τὸν πατέρα καὶ κύριον τῶν ὅλων μὴ γεγενῆσθαι τότε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅτε διὰ Μωσέως λέλεκται, Καὶ κύριος ἔβρεξεν ἐπὶ Σόδομα πῦρ καὶ θεῖον παρὰ κυρίου ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

That is,

When my God saith, *God went up from* Abraham: or, *The Lord spake unto* Moses: or, *The Lord came down to see the Tower, which the Sons of Men builded:* or, *God shut the Ark of* Noah *from without:* do not imagine that the very unbegotten God himself did descend or ascend from any place: for the unspeakable Father and Lord of all things, doth neither come into any place, nor walk, nor sleep, nor rise up, but abideth in his place wheresoever it is, sharply seeing, and sharply hearing, not with Eyes and Ears, but with an unspeakable Faculty he doth both overlook all things, and know all things, and none of us lyeth hid from him. Neither is he moved, who cannot be contained in a place, no not in the whole World, who was before the World had a Being. How then should he either speak or appear to any one, or present himself in a little parcel of the Earth? Neither *Abraham* therefore, nor *Isaac*, nor *Jacob*, nor any other of Men saw *THE FATHER AND UNEXPRESSIBLE LORD OF ALL THINGS SIMPLY, AND OF CHRIST HIMSELF:* but Him who is by his Will a God, being his Son, and an Angel, in that he *MINISTRETH* to his purpose and pleasure: whom also he would have to be born a Man by the Virgin: who also was sometimes made Fire in his Conference with *Moses* out of the Bush. Otherwise if we do not so understand the Scriptures, it will happen that the Father and Lord of the Universe was not then in Heaven, when it was said by *Moses, The Lord rained upon* Sodom *Fire and Brimstone from the Lord out of Heaven.*

Ibid. Pag. 281.

Ὅταν λέγῃ, Ἔβρεξε κύριος πῦρ παρὰ κυρίου ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, δύο ὄντας ἀριθμῷ μηνύει ὁ λόγος ὁ προφητικὸς· τὸν μὲν, ὀπὶ γῆς ὄντα, ὃν φησι καταβεβηκέναι ἰδεῖν τὴν κρευγὴν Σοδόμων· τὸν δὲ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχοντα ὃς καὶ τοῦ ὀπὶ γῆς κυρίου κυρίος ἐστιν, ὡς πατὴρ καὶ Θεὸς, αἴτιός τε αὐτῷ τοῦ εἶναι, καὶ δυνατῷ, καὶ κύριῳ, καὶ Θεῷ.

That is,

When he saith, *The Lord rained down Fire from the Lord out of Heaven*, the Prophetick Word intimateth twain in number; the one, being on the Earth, whom he affirmeth to have descended to see the Cry of *Sodom:* the other, abiding in Heaven, who is the Lord even of the Lord upon the Earth, as being the Father and God, and Author to him both of his Existence, and of his being powerful, and Lord, and God.

These many Testimonies have I faithfully cited out of the undoubted Books of *Justin Martyr*, who, as he himself intimateth, wrote his second Apology an hundred and fifty Years after the Birth of Christ. Now tho *Justin*, coming out of *Plato*'s School to the Contemplation of the Gospel, and (as preconceived Opinions are wont to stick very close, and over-rule the following Doctrines which

which we receive) imagining *John* the Evangeliſt to be of the ſame Opinion with *Plato*, believed there was a Son of God before Jeſus of *Nazareth* was born of the Virgin, yea before the World it ſelf was created, yet it is evident that he neither believed him to be from all Eternity, in that he ſaith God generated him at the beginning; nor to be co-equal with the Father, in that he ſaith the Son is ſubordinate to him, and miniſtreth to him, and hath him for his Lord. As for the Holy Spirit, he no-where ſaith that he is either God, or Lord, and expreſly placeth him in the third rank after God and Chriſt. Neither let any Man object that *Juſtin* in his Book entituled, *An Expoſition of Faith*, &c. aſſerteth the common Doctrine of the Trinity, for that Book is ſpurious, as appeareth both from the manner of Expreſſion, far different from that which he uſeth in his undoubted Works, and which ſheweth it to have been compoſed after the Council of *Nice*; and alſo becauſe *Euſebius* and *Jerom* make no mention thereof, though both of them diligently reckon up the Works which *Juſtin* wrote.

Tertullianus Coloniæ Agrippinæ Editus, Anno 1617.

Opera Jacobi Pamelii.

De Virginib. velandis liber, cap. 1.

Regula quidem fidei una omnino eſt, ſola immobilis & irreformabilis, credendi ſcil. in unicum Deum Omnipotentem, Mundi Conditorem, & Filium ejus Jeſum Chriſtum, natum ex Virgine Maria, crucifixum ſub Pontio Pilato, tertia die reſuſcitatum à mortuis, receptum in Cœlis, ſedentem nunc ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos & mortuos per carnis etiam Reſurrectionem.

That is,

The Rule of Faith is altogether one, alone immoveable, and unalterable, namely to believe in one God Almighty, Creator of the World, and in his Son Jeſus Chriſt, born of the Virgin *Mary*, crucified under *Pontius Pilate*, on the third day raiſed from the Dead, entertained in the Heavens, now ſitting at the Right-hand of the Father, being to come to judg the Quick and the Dead, even by the Reſurrection of the Fleſh.

De Præſcript. adv. Hæret. cap. 13.

Regula eſt autem fidei, ut jam hinc quid credamus profiteamur, illa ſcilicet, qua creditur, Unum omnino Deum eſſe, nec alium præter Mundi conditorem, qui univerſa de nihilo produxerit, per verbum ſuum primo omnium emiſſum: Id verbum Filium ejus appellatum, in nomine Dei varie viſum Patriarchis, in Prophetis ſemper auditum, poſtremo delatum ex ſpiritu Dei Patris & virtute in Virginem Mariam, carnem factum in utero ejus, & ex ea natum hominem & eſſe Jeſum Chriſtum: ex inde prædicaſſe novam legem, & novam promiſſionem Regni Cœlorum, Virtutes feciſſe: fixum Cruci tertia Dei reſurrexiſſe; in Cœlos ereptum ſedere ad dexteram patris: miſiſſe vicariam vim Spiritus Sancti qui credentes agat: venturum cum claritate, ad ſumendos ſanctos in vitæ æternæ & promiſſorum Cœleſtium fructum & ad profanos judicandos igni perpetuo, facta utriuſque partis reſuſcitatione cum carnis Reſurrectione.

That

That is,

Now the Rule of Faith, that we may from hence profeſs what we believe, is this, whereby it is believed that there is altogether but one God, nor any other beſides the Creator of the World, who produced the Univerſe of nothing by his Word firſt of all ſent forth; that that Word is called the Son of God, variouſly appeared to the Patriarchs in the Name of God, was in the Prophets always heard, was at laſt brought down by the Spirit and Vertue of God the Father into the Virgin *Mary*, made Fleſh in her Womb, and of her born a Man, and he is Jeſus Chriſt: then preached a new Law, and a new Promiſe of the Kingdom of Heaven, did Miracles, was faſtened to the Croſs, roſe again the third day, being ſnatched up into Heaven, ſitteth at the Right-hand of the Father; ſent the vicarious (or ſubſtituted) Power of the Holy Spirit which acteth in Believers; ſhall come with Brightneſs to take the Saints into the Fruit of Eternal Life and the Heavenly Promiſes, and to adjudg the Profane to perpetual Fire, having raiſed both parts with the Reſurrection of the Fleſh.

Adv. Hermogenem, cap. 3.

Ex quo eſſe cœperunt in quæ poteſtas Domini ageret, ex illo per acceſſionem poteſtatis & factus & dictus eſt Dominus: quia & Pater Deus eſt, & Judex Deus eſt, non tamen ideo Pater & Judex ſemper, quia Deus ſemper. Nam nec Pater potuit eſſe ante Filium, nec Judex ante delictum: fuit autem tempus cum & delictum & Filius non fuit, quod judicem & qui Patrem Dominum faceret.

That is,

Since things began to exiſt, whereon the Authority of the Lord might act, ſithence by an acceſſion of Authority he was both made and called Lord: for God is both a Father and alſo a Judg, yet not therefore always a Father and a Judg, becauſe always God. Since neither could he be a Father before a Son, nor a Judg before Sin: but THERE WAS A TIME WHEN BOTH SIN AND SON WERE NOT, which make the Lord a Judg and Father.

[Theſe Paſſages which we have quoted out of *Tertullian* evince that he alſo believed the Father only, not the Son, nor the Holy Spirit to be that one God. For though he, as well as the fore-cited Authors, imagined Chriſt to have two Natures, as is every-where to be ſeen, yet did he not ſuppoſe him to be co-eternal and co-equal with the Father, in that he ſaith, *God did firſt of all produce him*, and *that there was a time when the Son was not*. Yea that very Book of his againſt *Praxeas*, where the Adverſaries think he aſſerteth the Opinion now commonly held concerning the Trinity, doth by the Tenour of the Diſcourſe and ſundry expreſs Paſſages ſufficiently ſhew that he went not about to prove either that the Son, to whom he frequently giveth the Appellation of *God*, or the Holy Spirit, whom he in the cloſe calleth *tertium numen Divinitatis, & tertium nomen Majeſtatis, The third Power of Divinity, and third Name of Majeſty*, did exiſt from all Eternity, and were that one moſt High God.] See thoſe words.

Chap. 4.

Aiunt quidem & Geneſim in Hebraico ita incipere, In principio Deus fecit ſibi filium. *Hoc ut firmum non ſit, alia me argumenta deducunt ab ipſa Dei diſpoſitione, qua fuit ante Mundi conſtitutionem, ad uſque Filii Generationem. Ante omnia enim Deus erat ſolus, ipſe ſibi & Mundus & locus & omnia. Solus autem quia nihil aliud extrinſecus præter illum. Cæterum ne tunc quidem ſolus, habebat enim ſecum, quam habebat in ſemetipſo, rationem ſuam ſcilicet. Rationalis enim Deus, & ratio in ipſo prius & ita ab ipſo omnia. Quæ ratio ſenſus ipſius eſt, hanc Græci λόγον dicunt. Quo vocabulo etiam ſermonem appellamus. Idcoque jam in uſu eſt noſtrorum per ſimplicitatem interpretationis, ſermonem dicere in primordio apud Deum fuiſſe, cum magis rationum competat antiquiorem haberi;*

quia

quia non ſermonalis à principio, ſed rationalis Deus etiam ante principium; & quia ipſe quoque ſermo ratione conſiſtens, priorem eam ut ſubſtantiam ſuam oſtendat.

That is,

They ſay indeed that *Geneſis* in the Hebrew beginneth thus; *In the beginning God made himſelf a Son.* Though this be not firm, I am drawn by other Arguments from the very Diſpoſition of God, wherein he was before the Conſtitution of the World, even to the Generation of the Son. For before all things God was alone, being to himſelf both World, and Place, and all things. But alone, becauſe there was nothing without beſides him. Yet even then was he not alone, for he had with him what he had in himſelf, namely his Reaſon. For God was rational, and Reaſon was in him before: and ſo all things were of him. Which Reaſon is his Senſe or Underſtanding, and is by the Greeks called *Logos*. By which Name we alſo call a *Word* or Speech. And therefore it is in frequent uſe with our Men, through ſimplicity of Interpretation, to ſay that the *Word* or *Speech* was in the beginning with God, whereas it is more ſuitable that *Reaſon* ſhould be accounted the more ancient; becauſe God was not *Vocal* from the beginning, but he was *Rational* even before the beginning: and becauſe *the Word* or *Speech* it ſelf conſiſting in *Reaſon*, ſheweth it to be older as its Subſtance.

See alſo Chap. 7.

Tunc igitur etiam ipſe ſermo ſpeciem & ornatum ſuum ſumit, ſonum & vocem cum dicit Deus, Fiat lux. *Hæc eſt nativitas perfecta ſermonis, dum ex Deo procedit: conditus ab eo primum ad cogitatum in nomine Sophiæ:* Dominus condidit me initium viarum ſuarum. *Debinc generatus ad effectum:* Cum pararet Cœlum, aderam illi ſimul.

That is,

Then therefore the *Word* or *Speech* it ſelf taketh its Shape and Ornament, Sound and Voice, when he ſaith, *Let there be Light.* This is the perfect Birth of *the Word* or *Speech*, whilſt it proceedeth from God, having been firſt created of him by Cogitation in the Name of *Wiſdom: The Lord created me the beginning of his ways.* Then effectually generated: *When he prepared the Heavens, I was with him.*

See alſo Chap. 4.

Qui Filium non aliunde deduco, ſed de ſubſtantia patris, nihil facientem ſine Patris voluntate, omnem à patre conſecutum poteſtatem, quomodo poſſum de Fide deſtruere Monarchiam, quam à Patre Filio traditam, in Filio ſervo? Hoc mihi & in tertium gradum dictum ſit, quia Spiritum non aliunde puto, quam à Patre per Filium. Vide ergo ne tu potius Monarchiam deſtruas, qui diſpoſitionem & diſpenſationem ejus evertis in tot nominibus conſtitutam, in quot Deus voluit. Adeo autem manet in ſuo ſtatu, licet Trinitas inferatur, ut etiam reſtitui habeat Patri à Filio.

That is,

I who derive the Son no otherwiſe than from the Subſtance of the Father, doing nothing without the Will of the Father, having attained all Authority from the Father, how can I in truth deſtroy the Monarchy, which being delivered from the Father to the Son, I keep in the Son? Let this alſo be ſaid by me touching the third Degree, for I think the Spirit to be no otherwiſe than from the Father by the Son. See therefore, leſt thou rather deſtroyeſt not the Monarchy, who ſubverteſt the Diſpoſition and Diſpenſation thereof conſtituted in as many Names as God would have it. For it ſo remaineth in its ſtate, altho a Trinity be brought in, that it is alſo to be reſtored to the Father from the Son.

See alſo Chap. 8.

Tertius eſt Spiritus à Deo & Filio, ſicut tertius à radice fructus ex frutice. Et tertius à fonte, rivus ex flumine, & tertius à ſole, apex ex radio.

That

That is,

The Spirit is third after God and the Son, as the Fruit from the Branch is third after the Root. And the Brook from the River is third after the Fountain. And the Point from the Ray is third after the Sun.

And Chap. 9.

Pater tota ſubſtantia eſt, Filius vero derivatio totius & portio, ſicut ipſe profitetur: Quia Pater major me eſt. *A quo & minoratus canitur in Pſalmo, modicum quid citra Angelos. Sic & Pater alius à Filio, dum Filio major: dum alius qui generat, alius qui generatur: dum alius qui mittit, alius qui mittitur: dum alius qui facit, alius per quem fit.*

That is,

The Father is the whole Subſtance, the Son a derivation and Portion of the whole, as he himſelf profeſſeth: *Becauſe my Father is greater than I.* Of whom the Pſalm ſingeth, That he was made a little lower than the Angels. Thus is alſo the Father another than the Son, whilſt greater than the Son; whilſt he that generateth is another than he that is generated; whilſt he that ſendeth is another than he that is ſent; whilſt he that doth is another than he by whom it is done.

See Chap. 13.

Deos omnino non dicam, nec Dominos, ſed Apoſtolum ſequar, ut ſi pariter nominandi fuerint Pater & Filius, Deum Patrem appellem & Jeſum Chriſtum Dominum nominem; ſolum autem Chriſtum potero Deum dicere, ſicut idem Apoſtolus. Ex quibus Chriſtus, qui eſt, *inquit*, Deus ſuper omnia benedictus in ſecula.

That is,

I will not ſay Gods, nor Lords, but follow the Apoſtle, and if the Father and the Son be to be named together, call the Father God, and name Jeſus Chriſt Lord. But Chriſt by himſelf I may call by the Name of God, as the ſame Apoſtle ſaith, *Of whom came Chriſt, who is over all a God bleſſed for evermore.*

See alſo Chap. 28.

Sicut ergo Sermo Dei non eſt ipſe cujus eſt, ita nec Spiritus, etſi Deus dicitur eſt, non tamen ipſe eſt cujus eſt dictus. Nulla res alicujus, ipſa eſt, cujus eſt. Planè cum quid ex ipſo eſt, dum ex ipſo ſit, poteſt tale quid eſſe, quale & ipſe ex quo eſt, & cujus eſt. Et ideo Spiritus Deus, & Sermo Deus, quia ex Deo, non tamen ipſe ex quo eſt. Quod Deus Dei tanquam ſubſtantiva res, non erit ipſe Deus, ſed hactenus Deus, quia ex ipſius Dei ſubſtantia, quæ ſubſtantiva res eſt, & ut portio aliqua totius.

That is,

As therefore the Word of God is not He whoſe he is, ſo neither the Spirit, altho he be called God, yet is not he whoſe he is ſaid to be. Nothing of any one, is that very thing whoſe it is. Indeed when any thing is from ſome one, and ſo his whilſt it is from him, it may be ſuch as he is from whom it is, and whoſe it is. And therefore the Spirit may be God, and the Word God, becauſe of God; yet not that very one of which each of them is. Becauſe God of God, as a ſubſtantial thing, will not be very God himſelf, but therefore God, becauſe of the Subſtance of God, which is alſo a ſubſtantial thing, and as a Portion of the whole.

See alſo Chap. 25.

Adscendo ad Patrem meum, & Patrem veſtrum, Deum meum, & Deum veſtrum. Pater ad Patrem, & Deus ad Deum: an Filius ad Patrem, Sermo ad Deum?

That is,

I aſcend to my Father and your Father, my God and your God. The Father to the Father, and God to God: or the Son to the Father, the Word to God.

Now forasmuch as *Tertullian* sufficiently explaineth himself, that his Intention was not to assert that the Son and Holy Spirit were that one God, but on the contrary to refute *Praxeas*, who holding, as *Sabellius* afterwards did, that Christ and the Holy Spirit were that One God as well as the Father, did thereby confound the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, inasmuch as the distinction between the Essence and Person of God, was not yet invented; this, I say, doth warrant us to make use of his Testimony against the Adversaries in the business of the Trinity, so that we need not fly to that, which some, and that justly enough, make use of, when they are urged with the words of *Tertullian*, cited out of his Book against *Praxeas*, namely, that the high Notions which he there uttereth were learned from the new Prophet *Montanus*, whom he impiously calleth the Paraclete, and expresly mentioneth in the beginning of the Discourse, and intimateth in the close thereof.

Novatianus de Trinitate.

Cap. 1.

Regula exigit veritatis, ut primo omnium credamus in Deum, Patrem & Dominum Omnipotentem, id est, rerum omnium perfectissimum conditorem.

That is,

The Rule of Truth requireth that first of all we believe in God, the Father and Lord Almighty, that is, the most perfect Creator of all things.

Cap. 9.

Eadem Regula veritatis docet nos, credere post Patrem etiam in Filium Dei, Christum Jesum Dominum Deum nostrum, sed Dei Filium, hujus Dei qui & unus & solus est, conditor scilicet rerum omnium, ut jam & superius expressum est.

That is,

The same Rule of Truth teacheth us to believe after the Father likewise in the Son of God, Christ Jesus our Lord God, but the Son of that God which is both one and only, namely the Creator of all things.

Cap. 11.

Est periculum grande, salvatorem generis humani, totius Dominum & Principem Mundi, cui à suo Patre omnia tradita sunt, & cuncta concessa, per quem instituta sunt universa, creata sunt tota, digesta sunt cuncta, ævorum omnium & temporum Regem, Angelorum omnium principem, ante quem nihil præter Patrem, hominem tantummodo dicere, & authoritatem illi divinam in his abnegare.

That is,

It is a great hazard to say that the Saviour of Mankind, the Lord and Prince of the whole World, to whom all things have been delivered from his Father, and all things granted, by whom all things were instituted, all things created, all things ordered, the King of all Ages and Times, the Prince of all Angels, BEFORE WHOM WAS NOTHING BESIDES THE FATHER, is a Man only, and in these to deny him Divine Authority.

Chap. 13.

Usque adeo hunc (Christum) manifestum est in scripturis esse Deum tradi, ut plerique Hæt-

Hæreticorum, divinitatis ipſius magnitudini & veritate commoti, ultra modum extendentes honores ejus, auſiſſent non Filium, ſed ipſum Deum Patrem promere & putare.

That is,

It is ſo manifeſt that he (Chriſt) is in the Scriptures delivered to be a God, that moſt of the Hereticks, moved with the Greatneſs and Truth of his Divinity, have dared to declare and think him, not the Son, but the very God the Father.

Cap. 22.

Dum ergo ſanctificationem accipit à Patre, minor Patre eſt.

That is,

Whilſt therefore he receiveth Sanctification from the Father, he is leſs than the Father.

Cap. 24.

Accipit Paracletus (Spiritus) à Chriſto quæ nuntiet. Sed ſi à Chriſto accepit quæ nunciet, major ergo jam Paracleto Chriſtus eſt: quoniam nec Paracletus à Chriſto acciperet, niſi minor Chriſto eſſet.

That is,

The Paraclete (the Spirit) receiveth of Chriſt what things he declareth. But if he received of Chriſt the things which he declareth, CHRIST IS THEN GREATER THAN THE PARACLETE: FOR NEITHER WOULD THE PARACLETE RECEIVE FROM CHRIST, UNLESS HE WERE LESS THAN CHRIST.

Cap. 29.

Ordo Rationis & Fidei authoritas, digeſtis vocibus ac literis Domini admonet nos poſt hæc credere etiam in Spiritum Sanctum, olim Eccleſiæ repromiſſum, ſed ſtatutis temporum opportunitatibus redditum. —— Et quoniam Dominus in Cœlos eſſet abiturus, Paracletum Diſcipulis neceſſario dabat, ne illos quodammodo pupillos (quod minime decebat) relinqueret & ſine Advocato & quodam tutore deſereret. Hic eſt enim qui ipſorum animos mentesque firmavit, qui Evangelica Sacramenta diſtinxit, qui in ipſis inluminator rerum divinarum fuit, quo confirmati pro nomine Domini nec carceres nec vincula timuerunt; quinimmo ipſas ſeculi poteſtates & tormenta calcaverunt, armati jam ſcilicet per ipſum atque firmati, habentes in ſe dona quæ hic idem Spiritus Eccleſiæ Chriſti ſponſæ quaſi quædam ornamenta diſtribuit, & dirigit. Hic eſt enim qui Prophetas in Eccleſia conſtituit, Magiſtros erudit, linguas dirigit, virtutes & ſanitates facit, opera mirabilia gerit, diſcretiones ſpiritaum porrigit, gubernationes contribuit, conſilia ſuggerit, quæque alia ſunt chariſmatum dona componit, & dirigit, & ideo Eccleſiam Domini undique & in omnibus perfectam & conſummatam facit.

That is,

The order of Reaſon and authority of Faith, admoniſheth us, having digeſted the Words and Letters of the Lord, after theſe things to believe alſo in the Holy Spirit, heretofore promiſed to the Church, and given at the appointed Seaſons of the Times. —— And inaſmuch as the Lord was about to go away into the Heavens, he neceſſarily gave a Paraclete (Advocate) to the Diſciples, leſt he ſhould leave them in a manner Orphans (which was not becoming) and without an Advocate and a Tutor. For he it was who ſtrengthened their Hearts and Minds, who diſtinguiſhed the Sacraments (Myſteries) of the Goſpel, who was in them an Illuminator of Divine Things, with whom being confirmed, they for the Name of the Lord feared neither Priſons nor Bonds, yea trod under foot the Powers and Torments of the World, as being armed and ſtrengthened by him, having in themſelves the Gifts which this ſame Spirit diſtributeth and directeth to the Church the Spouſe of Chriſt, as certain Ornaments. For this is he which appointeth Prophets in the Church, inſtructeth Teachers, directeth Tongues, doth mighty Works and

Cures, performeth Miracles, affordeth Discernings of Spirits, contributeth Governments, suggesteth Counsels, and composeth and directeth all other Gifts, and therefore maketh the Church of the Lord on every side and in all things perfect and compleat.

Theophilus ad Autolycum, Parisiis editus, Anno 1636.

Lib. 2. Pag. 100.

Ὁ μὲν Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ τῶν ὅλων ἀχώρητός ἐστι, καὶ ἐν τόπῳ οὐχ εὑρίσκεται, οὐ γὰρ ἐστι τόπος τῆς καταπαύσεως αὐτοῦ. Ὁ δὲ Λόγος αὐτοῦ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα πεποίηκε, δύναμις ὢν καὶ σοφία αὐτοῦ, ἀναλαμβάνων τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου τῶν ὅλων, οὗτος παρεγίνετο εἰς τὸν παράδεισον ἐν προσώπῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ὡμίλει τῷ Ἀδάμ.

That is,

The God and Father of all things is Incomprehensible, and not found in a place, for there is no place of his resting. But his *Word*, by whom he made all things, being his Power and Wisdom, assuming the Person of the Father and Lord of all things, came into the Garden in the Person of God, and discoursed with *Adam*.

The Opinion of *Origen* touching the Son and Holy Spirit, as I find it recorded by *Epiphanius*,

Adv. Hæres. lib. 2. Tom. 1. Edit. Paris. 1622. *pag.* 531.

Ἐν πολλοῖς τόποις εὑρομὲν αὐτὸν τὸν μονογενῆ Θεὸν ἀπαλλοτριοῦντα τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς θεότητός τε καὶ οὐσίας, ὁμοῦ τε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.

That is,

In many places we have found him (*Origen*) alienating the only begotten God from the Deity and Essence of the Father, and also the Holy Spirit.

The

The Teſtimony of Arnobius, *who lived within the three firſt Centuries.*

Adv. Gentes Lib. 2. Hanoviæ Edit. Anno 1603. pag. 106.

ET *idco Chriſtus licet vobis invitis Deus, (Deus, inquam, Chriſtus, hoc enim ſæpe dicendum eſt, ut infidelium diſſiliat & dirumpatur auditus) Dei principis juſſione loquens ſub hominis forma, cum mortalium ſciret cæcam eſſe naturam, neque ullam poſſe comprehendere veritatem, poſitarum nec ante oculos rerum pro comperto habere & cognito, quicquid ſibi eſſe ſuaſiſſet: & prorſus ſuſpicionibus hæſitare, litigioſas ſerere atque intundere quæſtiones: omnia iſta nos linquere & poſthabere præcepti: neque in res eas, quæ ſint à noſtra procul cognitione dimotæ infructuoſas immittere cogitationes.*

That is,

And therefore Chriſt, mauger you a God, (Chriſt, I ſay, a God, for I muſt often repeat this, that the Ears of Unbelievers may cleave aſunder and burſt)* ſpeaking by the command of THE PRINCIPAL GOD, under the form of a Man; and knowing that the Nature of Men is blind, nor can comprehend any truth, nor of the things expoſed to the ſight, hath any certain and undoubted knowledg, whatſoever perſwaſion it may otherwiſe have; and that it wholly ſticketh in Suſpicions, ſowing and encreaſing litigious Queſtions: commanded us to abandon and ſlight all thoſe things, and not vainly to trouble our Heads with ſuch Matters as are far diſtant from our knowledg.

Ibid. pag. 120.

Poteſt ergo fieri, ut tum demum emiſerit Chriſtum Deus omnipotens Dus ſolus, poſtquam gens hominum fractior, & infirmior cæpit noſtra eſſe natura.

That is,

It may be that THE ALMIGHTY GOD, THE ONLY GOD, then at length ſent our Chriſt, when Mankind was more broken, and our Nature began to be more weak.

Lib. 3. pag. 123.

Poſſumus interim dicere, ad cultum divinitatis obeundum ſatis eſt nobis Deus primus: Deus (inquam) primus, pater rerum ac dominus, conſtitutor moderatorque cunctorum: in hoc omne quod colendum eſt, colimus: quod adorari convenit, adoramus: quod obſequium venerationis, expoſcit venerationibus promereamur. Cum enim divinitatis ipſum teneamus caput, à quo ipſa divinitas divinorum quæcunque ſunt, dicitur, ſupervacuum putamus perſonas ire per ſingulas.

That is,

We may in the mean time ſay, to diſcharge the Worſhip of Divinity, THE PRIME GOD is ſufficient for us: (I ſay) THE PRIME GOD, THE FATHER AND LORD OF THINGS, the Conſtitutor and Governor of all things. In him, whatſoever is to be worſhipped, we worſhip; whatſoever to be adored, we adore; whatſoever requireth veneration, we pleaſe with venerations. For ſince we have the very Head of Divinity, from whence the Divinity of all Divine Things whatſoever is derived, we think it ſuperfluous to go through every Perſon.

Ibid.

Lib. 1. Pag. 50, 51.

Sed si Deus, inquiunt, fuit Christus, cur forma est in hominis visus? & cur more est interemptus humano? —— Assumpsit igitur hominis formam, & sub nostri generis similitudine potentiam suam clausit, ut & videri posset, & conspici: verba faceret, & doceret: atque omnes exequeretur res eas, propter quas in mundum venerat faciendas, summi regis imperio & dispositione servatis. Quid enim dicis, rex summus ea, quæ in mundo facienda esse decreverat, sine homine simulato non quibat efficere? si oporteret ita fieri (quemadmodum dicitis) ita fortasse fecisset: quia non oportuit, aliter fecit.—Sed more est hominis interemptus. Non ipse neque enim cadere divinas in res potest mortis occasus. —— Quis est ergo visus in patibulo pendere, quis mortuus est? homo quem induerat, & secum ipse portabat. Incredibile dictu est, & cæcis obscuritatibus involutum. Si velis non cæcum est, & similitudini proximè constitutum. Si quo tempore Sibylla præsaga, oracula illa depromens, fundebat vi (ut dicitis) Apollinis plena, ab impiis esset cæsa atque interempta latronibus: nunquid Apollo diceretur in ea esse occisus? si vates Helenus, si Martius, aliique similiter vates hariolantes essent vita & luce privati, nunquid aliquis diceret, lege eos humanitatis extinctos, qui illorum per ora loquentes, vias rerum postulantibus explicabant? Mors illa quam dicitis, assumpti hominis fuit, non ipsius: gestaminus non gestantis.

That is,

But if Christ, say they, was a God, why did he appear in the Form of a Man? and why was he slain after the manner of Men? ——He assumed the Form of a Man, and under the similitude of our Kind hid his Power, that he might be both seen and viewed; might speak words and teach; and execute all those things, to do which he came into the World, observing the Command and Dispensation of THE SUPREAM KING. But you will say, could not THE SUPREAM KING effect those things, which he decreed should be done in the World, without A COUNTERFEIT MAN? Were it behooffful for it to have been so done as ye say, he would perhaps have so done it: because it was not behooffful, he did otherwise.——But he was slain after the manner of a Man. Not he himself, for neither can the term of Death be incident to Divine Things.——Who then was seen to hang upon the Cross, who died? the Man, whom he had put on, and carried about with him. It is incredible to be spoken and involved with blind Obscurities. If you will, it is not blind, and very near to a like Instance. If *Sibylla* the Prophetess, at what time she uttered those Oracles, being (as ye say) full of the Power of *Apollo*, had been wounded and slain by impious Cut-throats, would *Apollo* be said to have been slain in her? If the Prophet *Helenus*, if *Martius*, and other Prophets had, as they prophesied, been deprived of Life and Light, would any one say, that they were extinguished by the Law of Humanity, who speaking by their Mouths, explained the Ways of Things to such as demanded? That Death which ye speak of, was *THE ASSUMED MAN's, NOT HIS; THE BURTHEN's NOT THE BEARER's.*

[It appeareth by what we have quoted out of *Arnobius*, that He also believed the Father alone to be that Prime and only God, and Supream Monarch. But it is withal worth the observing, of what ill Consequence the Opinion of two Natures in Christ is. For *Arnobius* having (as others did before) imagined a pre-existence of Christ before he was born of the Virgin, thereby to remove *the scandal of the Cross*, and take off the reproach commonly cast on Christians, *that they worshipped a Man, and him put to Death in a most vile and ignominious manner*, doth accordingly in plain terms say, what his Opinion concerning Christ led him to, *that not Christ himself died, but the Man whom he had assumed, and carried about with him*, thereby giving the lie to the Holy Scripture that doth so frequently affirm that Christ, not a counterfeit Man, assumed

assumed by him, died for our Sins. But this is the less to be admired at in *Arnobius*, since we find *Tertullian* himself to have used the like expression.]

Adv. Prax. Cap. 30.

Deus meus, Deus meus, ut quid me dereliquisti? *Hæc vox carnis & animæ, id est, hominis, non Sermonis, nec Spiritus, id est, non Dei, propterea emissa est, ut impassibilem Deum ostenderet, qui sic filium dereliquit, dum hominem ejus tradidit in mortem.*

That is,

My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? This Speech of Flesh and Soul, that is, of Man, not of the *Word*, nor of Spirit, that is, not of God, was therefore uttered, that he might shew God to be impassible; who in this manner forsook the Son, WHILST HE DELIVERED HIS MAN UNTO DEATH.

[See whither the Opinion of two Natures in Christ, leadeth Men, causing them to deny that the Son of God died. How then is that any longer true which the Apostle saith, *Rom.* 5. 10. *If being Enemies we were reconciled to God by the Death of his Son?* How that *Rom.* 8. 32. *He who spared not his own Son, but delivered him for us all?* For according to *Tertullian*, *not the Son, but his Man was delivered unto Death.* How doth that consist, which the Son himself saith, *John* 3. 26. *So God loved the World, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him, should not perish, but have Eternal Life?* For according to *Arnobius*, yea, the greatest part of Christians, (if they will be true to their Principles) *not the Son, but an assumed Man was given.* When a Person assumeth any thing, and the thing assumed dieth, you cannot therefore say that the assuming Person dieth. Otherwise when a Man assumeth a Garment, (I use this Similitude, because the Adversaries are wont by it to explain the Incarnation which they have imagined) and the Garment is rent, or taken away, the Man may thereupon be said to be rent, or taken away. But the Adversaries will reply. The Scripture saith, *The Word was made Flesh*, John 1. 14. And doth not this imply an Incarnation, and consequently two Natures in Christ? Nothing less. For the Text may be as well be rendred, *The Word was Flesh*, since the Greek ἐγένετο here used, is in the 6th Ver. of this Chapter, and *Rom.* 11. 6. and in sundry other places, so rendred in our English Translation. Add hereunto, that so to render the words, is far more suitable to the scope of the place. For how absurd would it be for *John*, when he had already spoken of the things which the *Word* had done as Man, *as that he was in the World, enlightned Men; came to his own, and his own received him not*; afterwards to tell us, *that he was made Flesh*, that is, *a Man?* But if our Interpretation be admitted, all things exactly agree: for having spoken divers excellent things of Christ under the Name of *the Word*, and having ascribed Divinity to him, a Scruple might thereupon presently arise in the Minds of the Hearers, what might be the Nature or Substance of this *Word*, whether he were a Spirit, or God himself; wherefore to exclude all doubting concerning this Matter, he telleth them, *that the Word was Flesh*, that is, *a mortal Man*, as this Expression elsewhere in the Scripture denoteth. Furthermore, that the Interpretation of the Adversaries, together with their Inference thereupon, can at no hand consist, but that they must of necessity come over to our Opinion touching one Nature in Christ, I thus evince: If the *Word* was made Flesh; then he was either Something when he was made Flesh, or Nothing. If Nothing, there was no Incarnation, (since that implieth the adding of Flesh to that which is already Something); and consequently but one Nature in Christ. If something, then a Spirit, (as the Adversaries grant). If the *Word* being a Spirit was made Flesh, he ceased to be a Spirit, and was changed into Flesh: for when in the Scripture one Substance is said to be made another, it signifieth that one is changed into the other. Neither need we go far for an Instance,

ſtance, having a very punctual one in the ſecond Chapter of this very Goſpel of *John*, Ver. 9. *When the Ruler of the Feaſt had taſted the Water that was made Wine.* When the Water had been made Wine, it ceaſed to be Water, and was turned into Wine, as the Ruler of the Feaſt did well perceive by his taſte, calling the Bridegroom, and telling him *that he had (contrary to cuſtom) reſerved the good Wine until the laſt*, verſ. 10. Wherefore though it ſhould be granted to the Adverſaries, that Chriſt had a Spiritual Nature before he was born of the Virgin *Mary*; yet foraſmuch as in the place under conteſtation, (which is the chief, if not the only Text alleaged by them to prove an Incarnation) it is, according to their own Interpretation, ſaid, *that the Word was made Fleſh*; this clearly importeth, that he ceaſed to have a Spiritual Nature, and was changed into Fleſh, and ſo ſtill had but one Nature, namely, that of Fleſh or Humanity. Which was the thing to be proved.]

The Teſtimony of Lanctantius *the Diſciple of* Arnobius.

Divin. Inſtit. Lib. 4. Cap. 6.

Deus igitur machinator conſtitutorque rerum, ſicuti in ſecundo libro diximus, antequam præclarum hoc opus mundi adoriretur, ſanctum & incorruptibilem & irreprehenſibilem ſpiritum genuit, quem filium nuncuparet.

That is,

God, the Framer and Maker of Things as we ſaid in the ſecond Book, before he ſet upon this famous Work of the World, begat a holy incorruptible and irreprovable Spirit, whom he called the Son.

Ib. Cap. 13.

Ille (Filius) exhibuit Deo fidem: docuit enim quod Deus unus ſit, eumque ſolum coli oportere: nec unquam ſe ipſe Deum dixit: quia non ſervaſſet fidem, ſi miſſus ut Deos tolleret, & unum aſſereret, induceret alium præter unum. Hoc erat non de uno Deo facere præconium, nec ejus qui miſerat, ſed ſuum proprium negotium gerere, ac ſe ab eo, quem illuſtratum venerat, ſeparare. Propterea quia tam fidelis extitit, quia ſibi nihil prorſus aſſumpſit, ut mandata mittentis implerat, & ſacerdotis perpetui dignitatem, & regis ſummi honorem, & judicis poteſtatem, & Dei nomen accepit.

That is,

He (the Son) kept touch with God: for he taught that there is one God, and that he alone ought to be worſhipped: neither did he ever call himſelf God; becauſe he had not diſcharged his Truſt, if being ſent to take away God's, and aſſert One, he ſhould introduce another beſides One. This was not to preach concerning one God, nor to do the Buſineſs of the Sender, but his own Work, and to ſeparate himſelf from him, whom he came to illuſtrate. Therefore becauſe he was ſo faithful, becauſe he aſſumed nothing at all to himſelf, that he might fulfil the Commands of the Sender, he received the Dignity of a Perpetual Prieſt, and the Honour of a Soveraign King, and the Power of a Judg, and the Name of a God.

Ib. Cap. 29.

Propiore exemplo uti libet. Quum quis habet filium quem unicè diligit, qui tamen ſit in domo, & in manu patris, licet ei nomen domini, poteſtatemque concedat, civili tamen jure & domus una, & unus dominus nominatur. Sic hic mundus, una Dei domus eſt: & Filius ac Pater, qui unanimes incolunt mundum, Deus unus: quia & unus eſt tanquam duo, & duo tanquam

tanquam unus. Neque id mirum, quum & Filius ſit in Patre, quia Pater diligit Filium; & Pater in Filio, quia voluntati Patris fideliter paret, nec unquam faciat aut fecerit, niſi quod Pater aut voluit, aut juſſit.——— Unus eſt enim ſolus, liber, Deus ſummus carens origine: quia ipſe eſt origo rerum & in eo ſimul & Filius & omnia continentur. Quapropter quum mens & voluntas altrius in altero ſit, vel potius una in utroque, meritò unus Deus utrique appellatur: quia quicquid eſt in Patre ad Filium transiit; & quicquid in Filio, à Patre deſcendit. Non poteſt igitur ſummus ille ac ſingularis Deus niſi per Filium coli: qui ſolum ſe Patrem colere putat, ſicut Filium non colit, ita nec Patrem quidem colit. Qui autem Filium ſuſcipit, & nomen ejus gerit: is vero cum Filio ſimul & Patrem colit, quoniam legatus, & nuncius, & ſacerdos ſummi Patris eſt Filius.

That is,

I will uſe a nearer Example. When any one hath a Son, whom he entirely loveth, who notwithſtanding is in the Houſe, and in the Power of the Father, although he grant him the Name and Power of Maſter, yet in the Civil Law it is called but one Houſe, and one Maſter. In like manner this World is one Houſe of God: and the Son and Father, who unanimouſly inhabit the World, one God: becauſe both one is as two, and two as one. And no marvel, ſince both the Son is in the Father, becauſe the Father loveth the Son; and the Father in the Son, becauſe he faithfully obeyeth the Will of the Father, and never doth or did but what the Father either willed, or commanded.—— For there is one only, free moſt High God, without Original: becauſe he is the Original of things, and in him both the Son and all things are contained. Wherefore ſince the Mind and Will of the one is in the other, or rather one in both, both are deſervedly called one God: becauſe whatſoever is in the Father, iſſueth out to the Son; and whatſoever is in the Son, deſcended from the Father. Wherefore that ſupream and ſingular God cannot be worſhipped but through the Son: he that thinketh he worſhippeth the Father only, as he doth not worſhip the Son, ſo neither worſhippeth he the Father. But he that entertaineth the Son, and beareth his Name, he together with the Son doth alſo worſhip the Father, becauſe the Son is the Embaſſador, and Meſſenger, and Prieſt of the Soveraign Father.

Lib. de Ira. Cap. 2.

Primus autem gradus (per quem ad Domicilium veritatis aſcenditur) eſt, intelligere falſas Religiones, & abjicere impios cultus Deorum humana manu fabricatos. Secundus vero inſpicere animo, quod unus ſit Deus ſummus, cujus poteſtas ac providentia effecerit à principio Mundum, & gubernet in poſterum. Tertius cognoſcere miniſtrum ejus, ac vicarium quem legavit in terram, quo docente liberati ab errore, quo implicati tenebamur, formatique ad veri Dei cultum, juſtitiam diſceremus. De primo gradu eos excuſati videmus qui quum falſa intelligant, tamen verum non inveniunt. De ſecundo verò gradu eos dicimus cadere, qui conſentiunt unum eſſe ſummum Deum: iidemtamen à Philoſophis irretiti, & falſis argumentationibus capti, aliter de vitæ illa Majeſtate ſentiunt, quàm veritas habet, qui aut figuram negant habere ullum Deum, aut nullo affectu commoveri putant: quia ſit omnis affectus imbecillitatis, quæ in Deo nulla eſt. De tertio verò ii præcipitantur, qui quum ſciant Legatum Dei, tantumque dicini & immortalis Templi conditorem, tamen aut non accipiunt eum, aut aliter accipiant quàm fides poſcit.

That is,

The firſt ſtep (whereby we aſcend up to the Houſe of Truth) is, to underſtand falſe Religions, and caſt away the impious forms of Divine Worſhip framed by the hand of Man. The ſecond is, to perceive in the Mind, that there is one moſt High God, whoſe Power and Providence made all things from the beginning, and governeth them ſithence. The third, to know HIS MINISTER AND EMBASSADOR, whom he ſent into the Earth, by whoſe teaching being freed from the Error, where-

with we were entangled and held, and formed to the Worſhip of the true God, we might learn Righteouſneſs. From the firſt ſtep we ſee them ſlide, who when they underſtand the things that are falſe, yet find not out the Truth. From the ſecond ſtep we ſay they fall, who conſent that there is one moſt High God, yet being intangled by Philoſophers, and taken with falſe Reaſonings, do think otherwiſe of that only Majeſty, than the truth is, either denying THAT GOD HATH ANY SHAPE, or thinking THAT HE IS MOVED WITH NO AFFECTION: becauſe every Affection argueth Weakneſs, which hath no place in God. From the the third they are tumbled headlong, who knowing THE EMBASSADOR OF GOD, the Builder of a Divine and Immortal Temple, yet either receive him not, or receive him otherwiſe than the Faith requireth.

The Teſtimony of Euſebius Pamphilus *that renowned Scholar, who was in ſo high eſteem with* Conſtantine *the Great, that he was deemed worthy to be Biſhop of the whole World.*

De Eccleſiaſtica Theologia, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 6. *Edit. Pariſ. Anno* 1628.

Ὁ δὲ ἐπέκεινα τῶν ὅλων Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἄῤῥητόν τι ὢν ἀγαθὸν, καὶ παντὸς λογισμοῦ καὶ διανοίας, φωνῆς τε πάσης καὶ ἐπιθυμήσεως κρεῖττον, ὁμοῦ τῶν πάντων ὅσα ποτὲ ὄντα καὶ ὁποῖα τυγχάνει, αὐτοῦ τε τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, προσέτι δὲ καὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ, καθηγούμενος μόνος, εἰκότως ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσι Θεὸς ἀνείρηται παρὰ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ, φάντι, Εἷς κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα, εἷς Θεὸς πατὴρ πάντων, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων, καὶ ἐν πᾶσι. Καὶ μόνος μὲν αὐτὸς εἷς Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ χρηματίζοι ἄν. Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς, μονογενὴς Θεὸς, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς· τὸ δὲ παράκλητον ἅγιον πνεῦμα, οὔτε Θεὸς, οὔτε υἱὸς, ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ὁμοίως τῷ υἱῷ καὶ αὐτὸ τὴν γένεσιν εἴληφεν· ἓν δέ τι τῶν διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ γενομένων τυγχάνει, οὔτι δὲ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν· ταῦτα μὲν οὖν τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας ὧδέ πη διὰ τῶν Θείων φωνῶν παραδίδοται τὰ μυστήρια.

That is,

He that is beyond all things, the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, being an unexpreſſible Good, and exceeding all Conceit and Underſtanding, and all Speech and Imagination, and withal being the only Governour of all things, how many, and of what quality ſoever they be, and of the very Holy Spirit himſelf, yea further of the only begotten Son, is deſervedly ſtyled by the Apoſtle *the God that is over all, and through all, and in all,* when he ſaith, *One Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm, one God the Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all.* And he only may be called *that one God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* But the Son, *that*

that only begotten God, who is in the Bosom of the Father. And the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, NEITHER GOD, NOR SON, inasmuch as he hath not received his Production from the Father in like manner as the Son: but is one of those things which were made by the Son, for *all things were made by him, and without him was nothing made.* These Mysteries of the Catholick and holy Church are in this wise delivered by the Divine Oracles.

Ib. Lib. 2. Cap. 17.

———Δυνάμενος γοῦν εἰπεῖν (Ἰωάννης) καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος, μετὰ τὴν τῶν ἄρθρου προσθήκης, εἴγε ἓν καὶ ταὐτὸν ἡγεῖτο τὸ πατέρα εἶναι καὶ τὸν υἱὸν, αὐτόν τε εἶναι τὸν Λόγον, τὸν ὀπὶ πάντων Θεὸν, οὐχ οὕτως δ' ἐξέδωκε τὴν γραφὴν.———Μονονουχὶ σαφέστερον ἡμᾶς διδάσκων πρῶτον μὲν ἡγεῖσθαι Θεὸν, τὸν ἐπέκεινα τῶν ὅλον, αὐτὸν τὸν τῶν Λόγου πατέρα, πρὸς ὃν ἦν ὁ Λόγος. ἔπειτα μετ' αὐτὸν μὴ ἀγνοεῖν, ὡς ὁ Λόγος, αὐτοῦ ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς, οὐχὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ ὀπὶ πάντων Θεὸς, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς Θεὸς ἦν.

That is,

Whereas therefore he (*John*) might have said, *the Word was God* (or *the God*) with the addition of the Article, if he had conceived the Father and the Son to be one and the same thing, and that the *Word* was that God over all, he did not after that manner express it in writing.——— Well-nigh teaching us a more evident manner, to esteem him THE PRIME GOD, who is beyond all things, even the Father of the *Word*, with whom the *Word* was. Then after him not to be ignorant, that the *Word*, his only begotten Son, was not that very God, over all, but yet that he also was A GOD.

[Lo here, it is the Observation of *Eusebius* himself, that *John*, intending to shew that Christ was not the most High God, the same with the Father, doth in Greek call him *God* without an Article (which is wont to restrain the word to the most strict and excellent Signification) and we are therefore accordingly to render it *a God*, for when in Greek no Article is set before an Appellative, we are wont in our Tongue to express it by putting the indefinite Article [*a*] before it, whereas the Greek is destitute of such an Article. But when an Article is prefixed in the Greek, it is usual with us to express it by putting our definite Article [*the*] before it, or at least by omitting an Article, and using the word as a proper Name. Neither will this Observation seem over nice to him, who shall consider, that the English Translators themselves make use of it in rendring that Passage, *Acts* 12. 22, 23, 24. *And the People gave a shout, saying, It is the Voice of a God* (Gr. Θεοῦ) *and not of a Man. And immediately the Angel of the Lord smote him, because he gave not God* (Gr. Θεῷ) *the Glory, and he was eaten of Worms, and gave up the Ghost. But the Word of God* (Gr. Θεοῦ) *grew and multiplied.* See also *Acts* 28. 6. *They changed their Minds, and said that he* (Paul) *was a God* (Gr. Θεὸς.) And *Heb.* 8. 10. *I will be to them a God,* (Gr. Θεὸς) *and they shall be to me a People.* Neither let the Adversaries object, that Christ is called *God*, *John* 20. 28. and *Heb.* 1. 8. with an Article prefixed before *God* in the Greek. For in those places the Article retaineth not its force, but changeth into an Adverb of calling, ὁ Θεὸς being put for ὦ Θεοὺ, as the very English Translation sheweth. See a like Instance, *Mark* 15. 34. compared with *Mat.* 27. 46. in the Greek.

How plainly now doth *Eusebius*, by the Passages cited out of him, give Attestation to what I hold touching the nature of the Holy Spirit, so that one wou'd think I learned it from him: whereas I knew not either of his Book, or what was delivered therein, a great while after I had declared my Opinion. Where now is that usual brag of the Adversaries, that the Universal Church ever since the Apostles Times hath held the Opinion touching three Persons in one and the same Supream Godhead? Did not *Euse-*

bius, that great Antiquary, and ſearcher of the Chriſtian Libraries, and firſt Writer of the Eccleſiaſtick Hiſtory, know better than any Man that hath lived ſince his time, what had been generally held amongſt Chriſtians concerning the HOLY TRINITY? Neither let any Man go about to traduce him, (as ſome have done) by ſaying, that he was an *Arian*; for that doth not invalidate his Teſtimony concerning Antiquity. But whoſoever ſhall diligently peruſe, either his *Oration to* Conſtantine, or *his Evangelical Preparation and Demonſtration*, or theſe very Books of his, *De Eccleſiaſtica Theologia*, will find him to be no *Arian*, but an *Homouſian*. For whereas *Arius* held that God, before he began to make the World, created of Nothing a certain Spirit, called his *Son*, which was afterward incarnated; for which reaſon he and his Followers were called Ἐξανόμοι, or *Non entiani*. *Euſebius* on the contrary affirmed, that God, before he made the World, did, in an ineffable manner generate out of his own Subſtance a Son, who afterwards aſſumed a Humane Nature. If the Adverſaries reply, That nevertheleſs in the Second Perſon of the HOLY TRINITY, *Euſebius* pronounceth Sentence againſt me and my Opion. I anſwer, That he thwarteth, as well what they hold, as what I, in that he expreſly denieth the Son to be THE PRIME GOD. So that in this alſo, which is the main Matter, I have *Euſebius* on my ſide; and not only him, but alſo the Fathers who lived in the firſt two Centuries, or thereabouts. Neither could I ever meet with a Paſſage in the undoubted Book of them, who wrote in thoſe Times, which did aſſert the Son, or the Spirit, to be that one moſt High God. *Hilary*, who lived in the Time of *Conſtantius*, Son of *Conſtantine* the Great, doth, in his ſecond Book *de Trinitate*, explain thoſe words of *Matthew*, Chap 28. 19. *In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*; by ſaying, *In the Name of God, and of the Only-begotten, and of the Gift*. And having all along nowhere ſaid that the Holy Spirit is God, or to be worſhipped, concludeth the 12th Book, *de Trinitate*, in this manner.

Conſerva, oro, hanc fidei meæ incontaminatam religionem, & uſque ad exciſſam ſpiritus mei dona mihi hanc conſcientiæ meæ vocem, ut quod in regenerationis meæ ſymbolo, baptizatus in Patre, & Filio, & Spiritu ſancto, profeſſus ſum, ſemper obtineam: Patrem ſcilicet te noſtrum, Filium tuum unà tecum adorem: & ſanctum ſpiritum tuum, qui ex te per unigenitum tuum eſt, promerear.

That is,

Keep, I beſeech, this undefiled Religion of my Faith; and to the departure of my Spirit give me this Voice of my Conſcience, that what in the ſymbol of my Regeneration, being Baptized in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, I have profeſſed, I may always obtain: namely, that I may adore thee our Father, thy Son together with thee; and with thy Holy Spirit, which is from thee by thy only-begotten.

[I would have cited the Teſtimony of *Ignatius*, for he concurreth in the ſame Opinion with the foregoing Authors, namely, that the Father only is that one God; yet in ſmuch as the common Copies are interpolated, and that which is held the pureſt, and was taken out of the *Florentine* Library, hath ſomething in it, which argueth the Epiſtles to be ſuppoſititious, I have omitted him.

I will ſhut up all with a Teſtimony taken out of *Brightman*; which, though contrary to the Opinion which he held touching the Son and the Holy Spirit, as both his precedent and ſubſequent words ſhew, yet the tenor of the *Revelation*, as he intimateth, did extort from him. See his Comment on the *Revelation*, Chap. 1. 4. where he ſpeaketh thus. *Wherefore we muſt know, that throughout this Book, mention is made, both here and elſewhere, both in general of God, as the higheſt and chiefeſt Governour; for which cauſe he hath a Throne given him, as alſo of the Son and Holy Ghoſt as MINISTRING unto him, as by whoſe more nearly-joyned help, all things are made and done. Wherefore they are ſaid to ſtand before the Throne, as it were, in a readineſs, and as-*

though

though they did wait for the beck and bidding of their higheſt Governor. Thus far he. Now doth not this obſervation of *Brightman's* quite ſubvert his own, and conſequently the common Opinion concerning the Trinity? Would *John* in the *Revelation* bring in the Son and Holy Spirit Miniſtring to another, were they the moſt High God? Were not this the very way to make every one that readeth the Book, to have a falſe Perſwaſion concerning them? For if they think of them as they are deſcribed by *John*, (and how they ſhould otherwiſe rightly think of them, than as they are deſcribed by Sacred Writers, I cannot apprehend) they will conceive them to be Miniſters of God, and not God himſelf. And indeed this Book of the *Revelation* doth give an exact and clear Teſtimony, to my Opinion, touching the HOLY TRINITY. For Worſhip, Praiſe, Judgement, Dominion, and Salvation, are, throughout the whole Book nowhere aſcribed to the Holy Spirit, but only to God and Chriſt; and when they are aſcribed to Chriſt, he is no otherwiſe conſidered than as a Man, for he is either called *the Lamb*, or ſaid to have ſhed his Blood, or to be *the Chriſt of God.* See Chap. 1. 5, 6. *To him that hath loved us, and waſhed us from our Sins in his own Blood, and hath made us Kings and Prieſts unto God and his Father*; (Gr. *unto his God and Father*) *to him be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever.* Chap. 5. 8, 9, &c. *And when he (the Lamb) had taken the Book, the four Living-creatures,* (ſo the Greek hath it,) *and four and twenty Elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them Harps, and golden Vials full of Incenſe, which is the Prayers of the Saints. And they ſang a new Song, ſaying, Thou art worthy to take the Book, and to open the Seals thereof, for thou waſt ſlain, and haſt bought us* (ſo the Greek hath it) *to God with thy Blood, out of every Kindred, and Tongue, and People, and Nation: And haſt made us unto our God, Kings, and Prieſts, and we ſhall raign on* (or, over) *the Earth. And I beheld, and I heard the Voice of many Angels round about the Throne, and the Living creatures, and the Elders, and the number of them was ten thouſand times ten thouſand, and thouſands of thouſands, ſaying, with a loud Voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was ſlain, to receive Power, and Riches, and Wiſdom, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Bleſſing. And every Creature which is in the Heaven, and on Earth, and under the Earth; and ſuch as are in the Sea, and all things that are in them, heard I, ſaying, Bleſſing, Honour, Glory, and Power be unto him that ſitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.* Were Chriſt the moſt High God, *Coeternal, Coeſſential, Coequal* with the Father, how cometh it to paſs, that the Elders, yea the Angels themſelves, derive his Worthineſs to receive Honour, Glory, and Dominion, not from that ſublime Conſideration but from one far inferior, namely from his being *a Lamb ſlain*; which Expreſſion agreeth to him only as a Man? And were the Holy Spirit the moſt High God, yea or ſo much as to be worſhipped, how cometh it to paſs, that in this famous Doxology, ſet down for a Pattern to all ſucceeding Ages, there is no Honour and Glory aſcribed to the Holy Spirit, but only to *Him* (not, *Them*) that ſitteth upon the Throne, and to the Lamb. Surely the Doctrine of three Perſons in God was not known in the Time of the Apoſtle *John.*

Chap. 6. 16. *And ſaid to the Mountains and Rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the Face* (not *Faces*, as ſome, perverted by the Doctrine of three Perſons in God, have pictured him with three Faces) *of him that ſitteth on the Throne, and from the Wrath of the Lamb.*

Chap. 7. 8, 9. *After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude which no Man could number, of all Nations, and Kindreds, and People, and Tongues, ſtood before the Throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white Robes, and Palms in their Hands; And they cried with a loud Voice, ſaying, Salvation to our God which ſitteth upon the Throne, and to the Lamb.*

Chap. 11. 15. *The Kingdoms of this World, are become the Kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Chriſt.*

Chap.

Chap. 12. 10. *Now is come Salvation, and Strength, and the Kingdom of our God, and the Power of his Christ.*

Chap. 14. 4. *These were bought from among Men, being the First-fruits to God, and to the Lamb.* Why not the First-fruits to the Spirit also, if the common Opinion be right? Yea, the Saints are so far from being *the First-fruits to the Spirit*, that they themselves *have the First-fruits of the Spirit*, as *Paul* testifieth, *Rom.* 8. 23.

Chap. 20. 6. *They shall be Priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand Years.*

Chap. 21. 22. *And I saw no Temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty, and the Lamb, are the Temple of it.*

Chap. 22. 1. *And he shewed me a pure River of Water of Life, clear as Crystal, proceeding out of the Throne of God, and of the Lamb.* Why not out of the Throne of the Holy Spirit, if he be God, or the Author of Eternal Life? But it is well that some of the very Adversaries have long since observed, that the Holy Spirit is never throughout the whole Scripture said to sit, which is the posture of Soveraignty.

Those Humane Testimonies above-written have I alleged, not that I much regard them, as to my self, (who make use of no other *Rule* to determine Controversies about Religion, than *the Scripture*; and of no other *Authentick Interpreter*, if a Scruple arise concerning the Sense of the Scripture, than *Reason*); but for the sake of the Adversaries, who continually crake, *the Fathers, the Fathers*. And though such of them as dissent from the Church of *Rome*, lay aside this Plea when they have to do with Papists about sundry Points of Controversy, yet do they take it up again, in a manner waiving the Scripture, when they argue with me, and others of the same Judgment with me. For it is apparent, by what hath been produced, that the Fathers of the two first Centuries, or thereabouts, when the Judgments of Christians were yet free, and not enslived with the Determinations of Councils, asserted the Father only to be that one God, and so were in the main right as to the Faith concerning the HOLY TRINITY, however they went awry in imagining two Natures in Christ; Which came to pass, (as we before hinted) partly, because they were great Admirers of *Plato*, and accordingly (as *Justus Lipsius* somewhere saith) *did in outward profession so put on Christ, as that in Heart they did not put off* Plato, wittily applying his high Notions touching the Creation of the World, to what was simply and plainly spoken of the Man Christ Jesus in relation to the Gospel, by the Apostle *John*: partly, that they might thereby avoid the Scandal of worshipping *a crucified Man*, a thing then very odious amongst Jews and Pagans, and now amongst deluded Christians, who unless there were another Nature in Christ, which was not crucified, account it Idolatry, unsufferable Idolatry to worship him, thereby thwarting the most signal words of the Apostle *Paul*, who saith, *that Jesus Christ became obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name above every Name: that at the Name of Jesus every Knee should bow*, Phil. 2. 8, 9, 10. How apparent is it from these words, that according to the Judgment of *Paul*, Christ must therefore have *the Knee bowed to him*, and so be worshipped, because *he is highly exalted by God?* and that he was highly exalted by God, because *he was obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Cross*, both which agree to him only as *a Man*; and consequently Christ as *a Crucified*, but afterwards *highly exalted Man* is to be worshipped? Wherefore let us not be ashamed *of the Son of Man*, lest when he cometh to render a Reward to every one according to his doings, he be ashamed of us; but let us rather, with the beloved Disciple, *Rev.* 1. 5, 6. continually cry, *Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our Sins in his own Blood, and hath made us Kings and Priests unto his God and Father*; (and not, *to him that is Coessential with God the Father*, as the Council of *Nice*, which was beholden to the Platonists for this Notion, will have it) *to him be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever.* Amen. THE END.

Some Notes taken from Mr. Bidle's *Mouth whilſt he was in* Newgate.

1. ALL things are ſaid to be created by Chriſt, *Col.* 1. 16. but ſo as he was the firſt born of every Creature, *ver.* 15. and ſo as that God created all things by him, *Epheſ.* 3. 9. but it's impoſſible for any one to create by the moſt High God.

2. Chriſt forgave Sins, yet ſo as being the Son of Man, and empower'd by God, *Mat.* 9. 6, 8. and exalted by God, *Acts* 5. 31. by which means he is alſo become our Saviour, as this laſt place of *Acts* teſtifieth.

3. Chriſt is to be honoured as the Father; yet, becauſe the Father hath committed all Judgment to him, *Joh.* 5. 23. and that as he is the Son of Man, *ver.* 22, 27.

4. Chriſt ſearcheth the Heart; yet ſo, as having all Judgment given to him, *Joh.* 5. 22. whereby is implied an Ability, as well as an Authority, to judg. When Chriſt ſaith that he ſearcheth the Hearts, *Rev.* 2. 23. he ſpeaketh of himſelf as executing Judgment upon Adulterers, and giving to every one a Reward according to his Work. But it is certain that Chriſt, as a Man, is Judg; for Chriſt ſaith of himſelf, that the Father gave him Power to execute Judgment, becauſe he was the Son of Man, *Joh.* 5. 27. and *Paul* ſaith of him, that *God ſhall judg the World in Righteouſneſs, by that Man whom he hath ordained*, Acts 17. 31.

5. Chriſt is to have the Knee bow'd to him and to be worſhipped; yet ſo, as being *highly exalted* by God, and having a Name given to him which is above every Name, *Phil.* 2. 9. and ſo that this Worſhip tendeth to the Glory of another, even *God the Father*, ver. 11.

6. Chriſt is to be believed on, ſo as that he which believeth on him, believeth not on him but on another, namely, on him that ſent him, *Joh.* 12. 44. and ſo, that by and *through him we believe in God, who raiſed him from the dead, and gave him Glory.* 1 Pet. 1. 21.

7. Chriſt raiſeth the Dead; yet ſo, as having this enlivening Power given to him by the Father, *Joh.* 5. 25, 26.

8. Chriſt hath the Name of *Emanuel* (God with us) given to him; yet he is ſo God, that he himſelf hath a God, *Heb.* 1. 8, 9.

9. He hath alſo the Name of *the Lord our Righteouſneſs*, Jer. 23. 5, 6. (if at leaſt that Appellation doth not agree to *Iſrael*, mentioned a little before) but this Appellation is common to him with *Iſrael*.

As for the buſineſs of Attribution, when Men argue that Chriſt is God, becauſe what is attributed to God in one place, is attributed unto Chriſt in another, this arguing is very fallacious; for according to that (tho the uſual way of proving when Men ſpeak of Chriſt) *Moſes*, tho a Man, will alſo be God; becauſe what is attributed to God in one place, is attributed to *Moſes* in another.

1. *Moſes* is ſaid to be a Man, *Numb.* 12. 3. and elſewhere.

2. He is ſaid to be a God, *Exod.* 7. 1. *And the Lord ſaid unto* Moſes, *See, I have made thee a God to* Pharaoh. And *Chap.* 4. 16. ——*and thou* [Moſes] *ſhalt be to him* [Aaron] *a God.* So *Heb.*

3. He is prayed unto, and that to forgive Sins, *Numb.* 12. 11. *And* Aaron *ſaid unto* Moſes, *Alas, my Lord, I beſeech thee, lay not this Sin upon us, wherein we have done fooliſhly, and wherein we have ſinned.* There is the like again in *Exod.* 10. 16, 17. where *Pharaoh* calleth for *Moſes* and *Aaron*, and ſaith, *I have ſinned againſt the Lord your God, and againſt you. Now therefore forgive, I pray thee, my Sin, only this once*, &c.

4. He is worſhipped, *Exod.* 11. 8. *All theſe thy Servants* (ſaith *Moſes*) *ſhall come down unto me, and ſhall bow down themſelves unto me* [or *worſhip* me] as the word ſignifies.

5. It is ſaid of *Moſes*, *Exod.* 32. that he brought the Children of *Iſrael* out of *Egypt*, ver. 7. *And the Lord ſaid unto* Moſes, *Go, get thee down; for thy People, which thou broughteſt out of the Land of* Egypt, *have corrupted themſelves:* And *Chap.* 33. 1. But in the Preface to the Ten Commandments, *Exod.* 20. 1, 2. *God ſpake all theſe words, ſaying, I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the Land of* Egypt. See alſo *Deut.* 5. 6.

6. It's ſaid, the *Iſraelites* did believe in him as well as in the Lord, *Exod.* 14. ult.

And

And Iſrael *ſaw that great Work which the Lord did upon the Egyptians, and the People feared the Lord, and believed the Lord, and his Servant Moſes*; [Heb. *in the Lord, and in* Moſes *his Servant*.] Again, *Exod.* 19. 9. *Lo, I come unto thee in a thick Cloud, that the People may hear when I ſpeak with thee, and believe thee for ever*; [Heb. *in thee.*] So that the People ought to believe in *Moſes*.

7. *Moſes* promiſeth to the *Iſraelites*, that if they did keep his Commandments, he would give them Rain in its ſeaſon: but that was impoſſible for him to do, if he had no more than a human Nature, becauſe they would ſtand in need of Rain when he was dead, and conſequently, if he had not a Divine Nature, he could not give them Rain, eſpecially after his Death. See *Deut.* 11. 13, 14, 15, &c. *And it ſhall come to paſs* (ſaith *Moſes*) *that if ye ſhall hearken diligently unto my Commandments, that I will give you the Rain of your Land in his due Seaſon; the firſt Rain and the latter Rain, that thou mayſt gather in thy Corn, and thy Wine, and thy Oil*, &c.

8. He promiſed unto *Joſhua*, that he would be with him when he brought the Children of *Iſrael* into the Land of *Canaan*, which God had ſworn to give unto them: But this could not be, unleſs that *Moſes* had a Divine Nature, becauſe he, as a Man, was to die on this ſide *Jordan*, before *Joſhua* enter'd into the Land of *Canaan*. See *Deut.* 21. 23. *And he* (namely *Moſes*) *gave* Joſhua *the Son of* Nun *a Charge, and ſaid, Be ſtrong and of a good Courage, for thou ſhalt bring the Children of* Iſrael *into the Land, which I ſwear unto them, and I will be with thee*, &c. which things are attributed to God, *ver.* 3.

9. *Moſes* did great Works before the People, and led them forty Years in the Wilderneſs, to the very end, that they might know that he was the Lord their God. See *Deut.* 29. 5, 6. *And I have led you forty Years in the Wilderneſs; your Clothes are not waxen old upon you,* — *that ye might know that I am the Lord your God.*

10. *Aaron* is ſaid to be the Prophet of *Moſes*, *Exod.* 7. 1. but you ſhall not find elſewhere throughout the whole Scripture, that any are ſaid to be Prophets, unleſs either of the true God, as the Prophets of the Lord, 1 *King.* 18. 13. or of a falſe God, as the Prophets of *Baal*, 1 *King.* 18. 19. Now none will ſay that *Moſes* was a falſe God; and conſequently, if the reaſon of the Adverſaries in the matter of Chriſt, to prove him to be the moſt High God, be ſolid, *Moſes* would alſo be concluded to be the moſt High God.

Laſtly, the Apoſtle *Paul* ſaith, the *Iſraelites were all baptized unto* [or *into*] Moſes, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, 2. and to be baptized into one, and to be baptized into the Name of one, ſignifies the ſame; as appears by comparing *Rom.* 6. 3. and *Gal.* 3. 27. with *Act.* 2. 38. and *Chap.* 8. 16. If then Chriſt the Son be God, becauſe we are baptized into him, or in his Name, then *Moſes* will be God by the ſame reaſon.

Thus we ſee that *Moſes*, tho a Man, yet is ſaid to be a God, and is called Lord, and pray'd to under that Appellation to forgive Sin, is worſhipped, has attributed to him the ſame miraculous Work of bringing the Children of *Iſrael* out of *Egypt*, as is attributed unto God; that the *Iſraelites* did believe in him as well as in the Lord, and were required ſo to do; that he promiſed Rain in due ſeaſon to ſuch as kept his Commandments, and to *Joſhua* that he would be with him, in carrying the People into *Canaan*, altho, as a Man, he was to die before; that he did great Works, yea Miracles in the ſight of the *Iſraelites*, on purpoſe that they might know that he was the Lord their God, that *Aaron* is ſaid to be his Prophet, which is proper to the true God only; and in fine, that the *Iſraelites* were baptiz'd into *Moſes*, that is, as they commonly expound *Mat.* 28. 19. were dedicated to his Service and Worſhip in the higheſt degree.

Now if, notwithſtanding all theſe notable Allegations, *Moſes* is confeſſed to have but one Nature, and not to be the moſt High God; why ſhould not Chriſt likewiſe, of whom as many things are ſpoken in Scripture to prove him to be only a Man, and not God-man; Why ſhould not he, I ſay, be accounted to have but one Nature, notwithſtanding all the great things that are attributed to him?

FINIS.

THE ACTS OF Great Athanasius. WITH NOTES,

By way of Illustration,

On his CREED;

And Observations on the Learned Vindication of the Trinity and Incarnation, by Dr. WILLIAM SHERLOCK.

Printed in the Year, MDCXC.

The Acts of Great Athanaſius, *&c.*

THou ſhalt have no other Gods but *Me*, ſaith God himſelf, in the words of the Firſt Commandment: and again by the Prophet, *Hoſea* 13.4. *Thou ſhalt know no God but Me.* The ſame *Plain Truth* is as expreſly delivered in the New Teſtament; *Mark* 12.32. *There is One God, and there is none other but He.* 1 Cor. 8.4. *There is none other God but One.* Gal.3.20. *God is One.* This therefore is the Scripture-Propoſition, that *there is no other God but One*; or that *God is One.* But to this ſome Novelliſts have oppoſed a contrary Propoſition, that *there is more than One, who is God*; or that *God is Three.* There is, ſay they, a Father, his Son, and a Holy Spirit, diſtinct from both, each of which *is* God, and *a* God.

Now ſince the firſt of theſe Propoſitions has been judged by God himſelf to be ſo important, and ſo neceſſary to be believ'd and profeſt; that He has made it the very firſt of his Commandments to Men, and ſince the other is inconſiſtent with it, and contradictory to it: We muſt have as clear a Commandment and Revelation from God, to believe and profeſs the ſecond (which is to ſuppoſe, that God can make contrary Revelations, concerning an unchangeable Truth) as 'tis evident we once had for the firſt. And we the rather demand this, becauſe thoſe whom the Novelliſts have ſuperadded to the One true God, are in holy Scriptures as plainly denied to be Gods, or God, as the Father is affirmed to be that one true God: *Mark* 10.18. *Why calleſt thou me Good* (ſaith our Lord Chriſt) *there is none Good ſave One, that is God.* Epheſ. 4.4, 5, 6. *There is one Spirit,——one Hope, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm, one God and Father of all, who is above all.* In the firſt of theſe Texts, the Lord Chriſt denieth himſelf to be God; in the other, *the one Spirit* and the *one Lord*, being without doubt the Holy Ghoſt or Spirit, and the Lord Chriſt; and they being here diſtinguiſhed from, and oppoſed to the *One God*, 'tis evident they are as much denied to be the One God, as the one Hope, one Faith, or one Baptiſm are denied to be that one God.

The truth is, the holy Scriptures are ſo copious and plain in this matter, that the more learned Trinitarians confeſs, that the Doctrine of the Trinity is not founded on the Scriptures, but on the Tradition of the Church; ſo ſay *all the Catholick Doctors.* Some of them have not ſcrupled to own, that *this Doctrine is contrary to Reaſon*; and that ſuch as have *pretended to prove it by Scripture*, ſuo artificio vincuntur, *are beaten at their own Weapon, by their Adverſaries the Unitarians*; ſo ſaith D. *Petavius*, the moſt learned Writer of the moſt learned Order.

Dr. *Sherlock*, tho a Proteſtant, is not willing that this Queſtion about the Unity of God, ſhould be decided by the Scriptures only, but extols the Doctrine of the Trinity, as *the Traditionary Faith of the Church*, p. 31. He ſcornfully calls the Scripture (*p.* 29.) *the Note-maker's infallible and compleat Rule of Faith*, which alſo he repeats more than once; intimating thereby (for, what elſe can he mean?) that 'tis not Dr. *Sherlock*'s Rule of Faith, at leaſt not a compleat and infallible Rule, in his Opinion. At *p.* 151. he firſt puts this caſe; Suppoſe that the natural Conſtruction of the words of Scripture import ſuch a ſenſe, as is contrary to ſome evident Principle of Reaſon? Then he reſolves his

irreverent *Supposition* in these words, *Then I won't believe the Scripture.* Neither did this drop from him unawares; for he goes on there in these farther words, *How! not believe Scripture? No, no, I will believe no pretended Revelation, which contradicts the plain Dictates of Reason, in which all Mankind agree.* But all or very near all Mankind hath more than once agreed in *Idolatry* and *Polytheism*: it seems the *Vindicator*, had he lived in those times, would not have believed the Scripture, against *the agreed sense of Mankind*, but would have departed from the one true God, to Idols and more Gods. The *Socinians* are of a contrary mind. Hath the Holy Scripture, that is, hath God said it? They will believe, tho all Men and Angels contradict it: They will always prefer the infinite Wisdom of God, before the infallible Dictates of Humane, or Angelick Reason: *Rom.* 3. 4. *Let God be true, and every Man a Liar,* 1 Cor. 1. 25. *The Foolishness of God is wiser than Men.*

Well, but tho the Scriptures are not, by their own Confession, so favourable to them, as to their Adversaries the *Socinians*; yet I hope they are civil, and do not expressly deny the Scriptures: No, but what is next to it, they elude the plainest Texts by *Scholastick* and *Metaphysical* Subtilties; and then framing their Creeds out of these last, they absolutely refuse a Subscription to the Scriptures, and require Men to subscribe and swear to their Creeds, that are contrary to the first Commandment of Scripture, and to the Apostles Creed.

The most famous of their Creeds, is that of *Athanasius*. I will first say something of the Man, and then subjoin the Notes that have been made on his Creed by another hand.

Athanasius his first Preferment was *Deacon* to *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*; which, as the Discipline of the Church then was, is as much as now to say *the Bishop's Man*. Accordingly he waited on his Master to the *Nicene* Council, which assembled to judg of the Questions between *Arius* and the said *Alexander*. In this Council, *Athanasius* sometimes interposing, was noted to talk both so impertinently and so erroneously, that the Council thought fit to check him, and censure his Heterodoxy.

When the Council was ended, *Alexander* returned to *Alexandria*, where he died in the Year 326. The See of *Alexandria*, the second in the World for Authority and Riches, being thus vacant, there was a long Contention by several Competitors, for the Succession; and the People were so wearied with expectation, that at length a part of the Rabble cried up *Athanasius*, and he and they getting into the Church of St. *Dionysius*, forced two Bishops there and *then* (being the Night-time) to ordain him Bishop of the Patriarchal See of *Alexandria*.

The Bishops of *Egypt*, who were convened on this occasion to *Alexandria*, and without whose approbation, no Election to the Patriarchal or Metropolitan See was valid, by the Canons and Customs immemorial of the Catholick Church; the Bishops (I say) of *Egypt*, not only disapproved this Election and Ordination, but immediately *Anathematiz'd Athanasius*. But *Athanasius*, and his *Homoousians* were too crafty *for the honest and legal Party*. For they presently dispatched a Messenger and Letter to the Emperor *Constantine*, in which they notify to him the Election of *Athanasius* by the *Alexandrians*, and pray his Majesty's Ratification thereof. *Constantine* knowing nothing of *Athanasius*, and thinking the Letter to be written by consent and direction of such as had the Right of Election; approved by his Letters again the Election of *Athanasius* by the *Alexandrians*, and orders him to be owned Bishop and Patriarch of *Alexandria*. *Athanasius* immediately presents the Imperial Letters to the Vice-Roy or Governour of *Egypt*, and especially to his Opposers, who durst now make no further words of the matter. Thus, as was said of one of the Popes, *Intravit ut Vulpes*. But how did he govern? Why, he out-did the rest of that Pope's Character, *Regnavit at Leo*.

First; He procured the Governour to force the People to hear him, and to communicate with him. He put several of the

Alexan-

Alexandrian Clergy into Prison, and even into Irons. He beat some of the Egyptian Bishops with his Fists; he came into the Churches of others, where he broke the Altar and Communion-Cup, burnt the common Bible and (finally) demolished the Church it self. He depos'd some Bishops, and put into their room Persons who had been degraded for their flagitious Lives by his Predecessors. He conspired with one *Philumenus* against the Emperor, and consulted how to stop the yearly Fleet of Corn from *Egypt*, on which the Armies and *Constantinople* depended. He committed Fornication, and that with a Nun. These and abundance the like, and greater Enormities, provoked at length the Bishops of *Egypt* to write to *Eusebius*, Arch-bishop of *Nicomidia*, to apply the Remedy provided by the Canons, a Council of Bishops.

Hereupon a Council was called at *Cæsaria*, and the forementioned Crimes were sworn against *Athanasius* by the Clergy of *Alexandria*, and Bishops of *Egypt*: the Names of some of the Bishops were these, *Eusion*, *Eudemon*, *Callinicus*, *Ischyras*, *Euplus*, *Pachomius*, *Isaac*, *Achillas*, *Hermon*, *Adamantius*, *Arbathion*, *Annubion*, *Peter*, *Theodorus*. The Council summoned *Athanasius* to appear, and to answer concerning the manner of his Election, and to the objected Irregularities: but he, knowing his Guilt, thank'd them for their Love, and staid at home. Therefore the Council petitioned *Constantine* to command *Athanasius* to appear and answer: *Constantine* sends forthwith his Letters Mandatory to *Athanasius*, to present himself to the Council, which he appointed to be held at *Tyre* the next Year, being the Year after 335.

At *Tyre* *Athanasius* appeared, and brought with him some Bishops of the *Homo-ousian* Faction: He denied all that had been objected to him, and hired a Whore to accuse *Eusibius*, President of the Council, of Fornication with her: But *Eusibius* intrapped and convinced her in such manner, as Dr. *Sherlock* (out of the Lives of Dr. *Cave*) has ascribed to *Athanasius*, at *p.* 31. of his Vindication. So many Accusations were daily brought into the Council against *Athanasius*; that the Fathers thought fit to search into the very bottom of *Athanasius* his Matters; and therefore sent a Deputation of *six* Bishops into *Egypt*, to inform themselves by sight, and from the mouth of all Persons concerned about the Election and whole Carriage of *Athanasius*. These came back loaded with such and so many Accusations, charged by Oath on *Athanasius*; that the Council for the Honour of the Christian Name, and to purge the Church of such a Scandal, first synodically declared his Election and Ordination void; and then order'd, that he should no longer live at *Alexandria* to infect the place.

What should a lost Man do? His desperate Case admits of nothing but a desperate Remedy; and however that happen to succeed, he cannot be worse of it than he is: Therefore *Athanasius* takes Post for *Constantinople*, applies himself to some great Courtiers of the *Homo-ousian* Faction, and by them represents to the Emperor, that the Council of *Tyre* was wholly *Arian*; that they had believed all things against him, meerly out of hatred to him for his Zeal to the Nicene Faith; that therefore it was reasonable his Cause should be heard by some other Judg or Judges.

Constantine willing to do Justice, and desirous also to find *Athanasius* innocent, because himself was an *Homo-ousian*, calls the Cause to his own hearing, summons the Witnesses on both sides, and begins the whole Cause anew, being assisted by a Council of Bishops whom he called to *Constantinople*. But both He and the Council having heard the Accusers, and the Defence made by *Athanasius* and his Friends, he not only approved the Sentence of the Council of *Tyre*, but banish'd *Athanasius* to *Treves* in *Germany*. It was thought it should seem, he could do least hurt in this City; he being a Greek, and the City Latin and German, distant from *Alexandria* more than two thousand Miles, and the utmost Border of the Roman Empire on the barbarous Nations.

From

From this time forward, *Conſtantius* became an Unitarian; for having diſcovered ſo much Wickedneſs in the chief Aſſerter of the Nicene Faith; he began more ſtrictly to examine the Reaſons of that Faith, and finding them invalid, and that all Antiquity was on the other ſide, before he died he made Profeſſion of the Unitarian Doctrine, and was baptized by *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, Principal of the Unitarians. The Death and Baptiſm of Great *Conſtantine* happen'd in the Year 337. As for *Euſebius*, he alſo was by Church-men called *the Great*, for his *Piety*, *Miracles*, and ſuch a ſweetneſs and *dexterity in Buſineſs*, that he lived and died *Chief Miniſter* for Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, to the Emperors *Conſtantine* and *Conſtantius*. In the Perſon of this *Euſebius* ceaſed the Power of Miracles in the Chriſtian Church. There was at the ſame time another *Euſebius*, an Unitarian alſo, Arch-Biſhop of *Cæſaria*, he is called *the Learned Euſebius*, and is Author of the celebrated *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, and other Works. *Cujus trudito nomini & olim & hodie aſſurgit totus pene Orbis literarius*, ſaith the late Author of the *Hiſtoria Literaria Scriptorum Eccleſ.* p. 129. But to return from theſe admirable Men, to the no leſs admirable *Athanaſius*.

Conſtantine the Great was ſucceeded by his three Sons, *Conſtantine*, *Conſtans*, and *Conſtantius*: *Conſtantine* had for his ſhare *France*, *Spain* and *Great Britaine*; *Conſtans* had *Italy*, *Sicily* and *Africa*: *Conſtantius* had *Aſia*, *Egypt*, *Greece*, and part of *Illyricum*. Of theſe *Conſtantine* and *Conſtans*, in the Weſt, were *Homouſians*; *Conſtantius* in the Eaſt was an Unitarian. I ſaid the two firſt were *Homo-ouſians*, I uſe that term, becauſe there was yet no ſuch thing as a *Trinitarian*, the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt not being yet believed by any. Upon the Death of great *Conſtantine*, all baniſh'd Men (by the accuſtomed Clemency of new Princes) were permitted to return to their Homes; therefore *Athanaſius* alſo returned to *Alexandria*. But he behaved himſelf ſo much worſe than ever, that the *Alexandrians* wrote to *Conſtantius*, humbly and moſt earneſtly petitioning, that *Athanaſius* might be either put to death, or baniſh'd. Upon this *Conſtantius* called a Council at *Antioch*, in the Year 341, at which were preſent 99 Biſhops; theſe again deprived *Athanaſius*, and ſubſtituted in his room *Gregorius*.

Athanaſius fled to *Rome* to Pope *Julius*, who being a great Aſſerter of the Nicene Faith, wrote to the Biſhops of the Eaſt, that *Athanaſius* might return to his Epiſcopal Charge at *Alexandria*. The Eaſtern Biſhops therefore convened to *Antioch*, and return Anſwer, That they are very ſorry *Julius* ſhould take part with Murderers, Demoliſhers of Churches, Corrupters of holy Virgins, Robbers of the Church-plate, Inventers of *unſcriptural Words and Forms* in matters of Faith, Traitors to the Emperor, and to their Native Country; they ſaid *the whole Eaſt* was witneſs of theſe things, and therefore deſire *Julius* not to tranſgreſs the Canons of the Church, by receiving or favouring ſuch Perſons.

In the mean time the *Homo-ouſian* Brothers, *Conſtantine* and *Conſtans* fall out; *Conſtantine* was vanquiſh'd and killed, and *Conſtans* immediately ſeized his part of the Empire, and added it to his own: ſo now *Conſtans* was Emperor of the whole Weſt, and *Conſtantius* of the Eaſt. *Athanaſius* applied himſelf to *Conſtans*, tells him, that he had ſuffered ſo much and ſo long for the Nicene Faith, that all the reſt was Calumny invented by Adverſaries, and believed in the Councils becauſe the Fathers were *Arians*; and therefore prays that he may be reſtored to his See and Authority. *Conſtans* upon this writes to his Brother *Conſtantius*, that a Council might be held at *Sardica* in *Illyricum*, that ſhould conſiſt of the Biſhops both of the Eaſt and Weſt. Accordingly a Council is called there, *Anno* 347. The Weſtern Biſhops arrived firſt, and knowing the mind of *Conſtans*, took *Athanaſius*, and all other depoſed and excommunicated Biſhops into Council with them, and even communicated alſo with them, contrary to the Canons of the Univerſal Church. Therefore when the Eaſtern

Biſhops

Biſhops arrived, before they would enter into the Seſſions place, they deſire of the Weſterns, that *Athanaſius* and other condemned Perſons might withdraw, and not ſit in Council as Judges, or as having right of Suffrage, till they ſhould be legally and juridically reſtored. But the Weſtern Biſhops having committed a fault, reſolved to ſtand in it; and accordingly anſwer, That they knew no fault by *Athanaſius* and the reſt, and therefore would not remove them from their Seſſion. The Eaſterns replied, that then the Eaſtern Biſhops would hold a Council by themſelves, and admoniſh the Weſterns:

1. That it was contrary to Canon and Cuſtom, that an Eaſtern Biſhop (as *Athanaſius* confeſſedly was) ſhould be judged by any but the Eaſterns.

2. That it was ſtrange they ſhould know no fault by *Athanaſius*, whom all the World knew to ſtand deprived by the Councils of *Tyre*, *Conſtantinople* and *Antioch*, and by Great *Conſtantine*.

3. That *Athanaſius* would not have dared to appeal from theſe Sentences, but that his Perſon and the proofs of his Crimes were unknown to the Weſtern Biſhops, and many of his principal Accuſers either ſo far diſtant in place, that they could not be called, or after ſo long time (twelve Years) wholly withdrawn by Death. Notwithſtanding,

4. They offer'd, that a Deputation of Weſtern and Eaſtern Biſhops ſhould be ſent into *Egypt*, to examine all matters afreſh. And whereas *ſix* Biſhops had been formerly deputed by the Tyrian Council, and had brought back the Teſtimonies and Evidences of the Crimes charged on *Athanaſius*, *five* of theſe Biſhops (the *firſt* being dead) offer'd to be condemned and deprived, without appealing either to the Emperor or to a Council, if the new deputed Biſhops (that ſhould be appointed by the Weſtern as well as the Eaſtern Biſhops, and ſhould conſiſt of both) did not confirm the whole Charge formerly brought out of *Egypt*, and on which *Athanaſius* was condemned by Great *Conſtantine*, and by the Tyrian and Conſtantinopolian Councils.

But the Weſtern Biſhops knew the mind of their Emperor *Conſtans*, and therefore refuſed this, and all other Offers; nay, they proceeded ſo far, as to procure a menacing Letter from *Conſtans* to the Eaſtern Biſhops, to terrify them into compliance with him, and with the Weſterns. But the Letter had no effect upon them.

For the Eaſtern Biſhops aſſembled in Council in a place by themſelves, and proteſted againſt the Weſtern Conventicle, as made up (for the moſt part) of Perſons uncapable of Seſſion or Vote in Council: afterwards they declared *Julius* of *Rome*, *Paulus* of *Conſtantinople*, *Athanaſius* of *Alexandria*, *Hoſius* of *Cordua*, excommunicate and depoſed, and wrote an Encyclical Letter of all their Decrees, to all Biſhops and Churches. The Proceedings of the Eaſtern Biſhops, and their Offers and Reaſons had been ſo fair and clear, that all Men were ſatisfied with them; and therefore all the Churches every-where owned the Eaſtern Biſhops to be the true and only Council of *Sardica*. Even St. *Auſtin* does more than once profeſs, that he knew no other Council of *Sardica*, but that of the *Arians*: For he was (it ſhould ſeem) aſhamed to call that Convention of Weſtern Biſhops (who had obſerved no Conciliary Method, and had trampled upon all the Canons) a Council.

For all this, the Weſtern Biſhops went on in their deſign, or rather the deſign of their Emperor *Conſtans*, which was, to pick a Quarrel with his Brother *Conſtantius*. They reſtored all the depoſed and excommunicated Biſhops, and chiefly *Athanaſius*; and made thoſe famous Decrees and Canons, on which all Learned Men know, that the Supremary of the Biſhops of *Rome* is ſolely founded, and which from that time forward the Biſhops of *Rome* have ever practiſed. So that at the ſame time, theſe Fathers reſtored *Athanaſius*, and ſet up Anti-Chriſt. I challenge Dr. *Sherlock* in his next, to deny (if he can) that the Popes Supremacy was firſt decreed and ordained, by this Sardican Conventicle

ticle of Western Bishops, that restored *Athanasius*, and consequently, that Popery and Athanasianism were introduced at the same time, and by the same Persons.

This Conventicle having done what their Master required of them, *Constans* not long after wrote this Complemental Brotherly Letter to *Constantius*.

" *Athanasius* has proved, that the Bi-
" shoprick of *Alexandria* belongeth of
" right to him: Therefore let him be by
" you restor'd, or I will restore him by
" Arms.

Constantius being at that time inagaged with the Persians, judged it not for the safety of his Empire, to have to do at the same time with them, and with his Brother; and therefore agreed, that *Athanasius* should return to *Alexandria*. The next Year (being the Year after Christ 350,) God raised up an Enemy to *Constans*; for *Magnentius* slew him, and possest himself of the Western Empire. But *Anno* 353, the Emperor *Constantius*, in revenge of his Brother, fought and overcame *Magnentius*, and made himself absolute Lord both of the East and West Empires. The same Year a Council was held at *Arles*, in which *Athanasius* was again condemned. And in the Year 355, the Council of *Milan*, consisting of 300 Bishops, did also condemn *Athanasius* and his few Adherents. So *Athanasius* fled from *Alexandria*, and St. *George* is appointed by the Council to succeed him.

This is that St. *George*, the Honorary Saint of *England*, whose Anniversary Day is here kept on *April* 23; some of our late Kings have chosen to be crowned on his Day. The Soveraign and Knights of the most noble Order of the Garter, are from him called Knights of St. *George*. Many honourable Families of this and other Nations, are surnamed from him. His Memory is yet so famous over all the East, that the very Turks do honour to him, as an Hero and a Saint, by the Name of *Gorges*. He died a Martyr under the Reign of *Julian* the Apostate.

George was born a Gentleman, and was in his younger Years a Souldier; and having been a very brave Officer, was in time of Peace advanced to be *Treasurer* of the Imperial Exchequer at *Constantinople*. He is commonly pictured on Horse-back, arm'd and fighting with a Dragon in defence of a Virgin Lady; because when he was a Tribune or *Colonel*, he had rescued a Maiden Lady from a Dragon, with his Spear and Sword. But some turn this part of St. *George*'s Story into a Moral, and say, this Victory was obtained by *George* in his old Age. The Dragon (say they) was *Athanasius*, and the Virgin was the Church of *Alexandria*, which he by his Eloquence, Learning and Piety defended from the venemous and mortal Breath and Corruptions of *Athanasius*.

But however that be, 'tis certain our *George* applied himself very hard to his Study, after he was made Treasurer of the Exchequer; and gained the Reputation of the most learned of all Men of his time, in the Trinitarian Questions. When therefore he came to *Alexandria*, *sent by the Council of Milan*; he was received with so much Honour and Respect, that the Emperor *Constantius* was extreamly pleased, and wrote a Letter to the Alexandrians, in which he calls their Bishop, *the most Venerable* George, *a Man* (saith he) *the most skilful of all Mortals in these Questions. In whom the noble Alexandrians may confide, as in a Sacred Anchor.* Then the Emperor thanks them for deserting (they are the very words of his Letter) *that Impostor and Conjurer Athanasius*, and for adhering to *holy George*. He assures them, he should think himself in a fault, if he did not exceed their Founder, Great *Alexander*, in Kindness to and Esteem of their Royal City, and their Persons. But to resume the History of *Athanasius* and his Doctrine.

In the Year 357, a General Council was called at *Syrmium*; here *Hosius* (who had been President of the Nicene Council, and of the Sardican Conventicle) and the other Fathers who had compoſed the Nicene Council, and that were Authors of the Nicene Creed,

Creed, did now make a contrary Creed; in which they forbid all mention of *Homo-ousios*, and declare that the Son had a Beginning, and was inferior to the Father in Godhead, Power, and all other reſpects.

In the Year 359, all the Biſhops of the World aſſembled to the Council of *Ariminum*. And whereas it had been hitherto ſaid by ſome, that the Son is *Homo-ousios*, i. e. *of like and equal Nature and Subſtance with the Father:* by others that he is *Homoi-ousios*, i. e. tho not of equal, yet *of like Nature and Subſtance with the Father*, becauſe he has a ſpiritual, and in ſome ſenſe a Divine Nature; the Council at *Ariminum* did not think fit that the Son ſhould be at all compared with God, nor yet meer and common Creatures, and therefore rejected both *Homo-ousios*, and *Homoi-ousios*, and required that it be only ſaid, *The Son is not a Creature like unto other Creatures.* This was the very Doctrine of *Arius*, and ſeems to have been taken out of his Writings; for in his Letter to *Alexander*, he ſaith of the Son, *He is a perfect Creature of God, but not like any of the reſt.* And again, *Made, but not like other things that are made.*

But the Reader will ſay, This is a Tale of *Athanaſius*, ſo every way contrary to that of Dr. *Sherlock* in his Vindication; that of neceſſity one of them is not only falſe, but a wilful Forgery, at leaſt in the firſt Authors; and 'tis not obvious, how an unlearned Man ſhould judg with any certainty, which of them is true, and which falſe. I anſwer; A Judicious Perſon may fully ſatisfy himſelf without being at the trouble of a laborious Search. For,

1. The Offer of the Eaſtern Biſhops at *Sardica*, while the Emperor *Conſtans* was yet alive, That a new Deputation of Biſhops ſhould be ſent into *Egypt*, and if they found that the Depoſitions brought to the Tyrian and Conſtantinopolitan Councils were in any particular falſe, that then the five ſurviving Biſhops would be depoſed without appealing to *Cæſar*, or to a Council. This Offer, I ſay, was ſuch, as did then ſatisfy all honeſt and conſidering Men, and in all Ages to come will ſatisfy all ſuch. It alſo demonſtrates the Falſhood of what Dr. *Sherlock*, from his *Legendary* Authors, ſays, That at the Council of *Milan*, *Conſtantius* drew his Sword, and ſcared the Fathers into compliance. For what need that, when the Evidence againſt *Athanaſius* was ſo undeniable, that *Conſtans* and the Conventicle of *Sardica* durſt not ſuffer the Cauſe to be re-examined, or permit a Deputation of Biſhops to be ſent into *Egypt*, but acquitted *Athanaſius* without any Trial, only becauſe the Emperor *Conſtans* wanted a Quarrel with his Brother *Conſtantius*?

2. Who that conſiders at all, can give Credit to one or two partial Hiſtorians of the Nicene Faction, and who lived an Age after *Athanaſius* and all theſe Councils, *againſt Conſtantine* the Great, a Prince the moſt juſt and honourable that (perhaps) ever managed the Roman Empire, and an *Homo-ousian* (by Confeſſion of all Parties) at what time he condemned *Athanaſius*, and baniſh'd him to *Treves*; alſo *againſt* ſo many and great Councils of learned and holy Biſhops, in ſome of which Councils the Preſident and all the Nicene Fathers were preſent and conſented: Laſtly, againſt Hiſtorians that were contemporary to *Athanaſius* and to theſe Councils? Dr. *Sherlock*'s Calumny, that the Fathers at *Ariminum* were in a manner ſtarved into Compliance, is ſo falſe; that all the ancient Hiſtorians, *of both Parties*, witneſs, that the Emperor not only bore the whole Charges of all the Biſhops to and from the Council, but alſo allowed to each of them a very honourable Sallary, during all the time of their being there. But the Nicene Faith being given up at *Ariminum*, by the Nicene Fathers themſelves, it was neceſſary for the Men of that Perſwaſion in after-Ages, to deviſe ſomething to ward off ſo great a Blow, as the Authority of the greateſt Council that ever was; a Council conſiſting of all the Biſhops of the whole World.

3. Whereas this is the Queſtion between Dr. *Sherlock* and the Author of *the brief Notes*, Whether or no *Athanaſius* was as vicious in his Life, and his Doctrine as erroneous, as is pretended in the brief Notes; and

whether the before-mentioned Councils did *freely* so judg? I say, this being the Question, Dr. *Sherlock* because he cannot deny the matter of Fact, that *Athanasius* was often condemned by these Councils, and that his and the Nicene Doctrine was not only rejected, but a contrary Doctrine advanced, therefore he pretends that the Fathers in these Councils were for the most part good, honest, Catholick Bishops, and only awed into Compliance by the Emperor *Constantius*. To this I say therefore, let the Doctor take his Option, either *Athanasius* was thought as guilty, and his Doctrine freely judged as erroneous, as the Author of the brief Notes has said; or all Dr. *Sherlock*'s good, honest Catholick Bishops were a pack of the greatest Villains in nature, in condemning a Person whom they believed to be most innocent, and a Doctrine which they held to be fundamental and necessary to Salvation. In a word, the Doctor must either give up his dear *Athanasius*, or the Bishops of the whole World, whom he pretends to have been Catholick.

But this shall suffice concerning *Athanasius*, and the countenance which he and his Doctrine found in the Catholick Church of that Age, in answer to the fair Tale Dr. *Sherlock* has told in his Vindication, out of that *accurate and faithful* Historian Dr. *Cave*. Let us now consider the Creed, that they have imposed on us by the name of St. *Athanasius* his Creed.

Brief Notes on the Creed of St. Athanasius.

Creed. "WHosoever will be saved, be-
"fore all things, 'tis necessa-
"ry that he hold the Catholick Faith.

Notes. *A Good Life* is of absolute necessity to Salvation; but *a Right Belief* in these Points that have been always controverted in the Churches of God, is in no degree Necessary, much less *Necessary before all things*. He that leads a profane or vicious Life, sins against *a plain acknowledged Rule*, and the express unquestioned Words and *Letter* of the Divine Law, and the Dictates of Natural Conscience; He *wilfully refuses* to advert to these Monitors, and therefore can no ways palliate or excuse his Wickedness. But he that errs in a Question of Faith, after having used *reasonable Diligence* to be rightly inform'd, is in no fault at all; *his Error is pure Ignorance*. Not a culpable Ignorance; for how can it be culpable, not to know that, of which a Man is ignorant after *a diligent and impartial Inquiry?*

Creed. "Which Faith except a Man keep
"Whole and Undefiled, without doubt he
"shall perish everlastingly.

Notes. By keeping this Faith *Whole and Undefiled*, must be meant (if any thing be meant) that a Man must believe and profess it, *without Adding to it, or Taking from it*. If we take ought from it, we do not keep it *Whole*; if we add any thing to it, we do not keep it *Undefiled*: and either way we shall perish everlastingly.

First, for *Adding*. What if an honest plain Man, *because He is a Christian and a Protestant*, should adds this Article to the Creed? "I believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old
"and New Testaments, to be a Divine, an
"Infallible and *Compleat Rule*, both for Faith
"and Manners. I hope no Protestant would think a Man shall be damned for such Addition: And if so, then this Creed of *Athanasius* is at least *an Unnecessary Rule* of Faith.

Then for *taking ought from* this Creed; the whole Greek Church (diffused through so many Provinces) rejects, *as Heretical*, that Period of it, "*The Holy Ghost is of the Father,*
"*and of the Son*: contending that the Holy Spirit is *from the Father only*. Which also they demonstratively prove, as we shall see in its proper

proper place. As for the Menace here of *Athanaſius*, that they ſhall periſh Everlaſtingly; they laugh at it, and ſay, *He was drunk when he made this Creed.* Gennad. Shol. A. Bp. of *Conſtantinople.*

Creed. "And the Catholick Faith is this.

Notes. Catholick Faith, is as much as to ſay in plain Engliſh, the Faith *of the whole* Church. Now in what Age was this which here follows, the Faith of *the whole* Church? Not in the Age of *Athanaſius* himſelf; who for this Faith, and for Seditious Practices, was baniſh'd from *Alexandria* in *Egypt* (where he was Biſhop) no leſs than *four* times; whereof the firſt was by *Conſtantine* the Great. He was alſo condemned in his own Life-time by *ſix* Councils, as an Heretic, and Seditious Perſon: Of theſe Councils, that at *Milan* conſiſted of 300 Biſhops; and that of *Ariminum* of 550, the greateſt Convention of Biſhops that ever was.

For the times Before and After, the curious Reader may ſee *Chr. Sandius* his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory: in which the Learned Author gives a large account, by *what* and *whoſe* means the Athanaſian and Trinitarian Faith did at length prevail, againſt *the Ancient Belief* of but One God, or *but One who is God.* Therefore *quære*, With what Forehead the Anthor of this Creed, calls this, *the Catholick Faith?* when 'tis certain it has been ſo in no Age, and leaſt of all in the (pretended) Author's.

Creed. "The Catholick Faith is this, That "we worſhip One God in Trinity; and Tri-"nity in Unity.'

Notes. He means here, that we muſt ſo worſhip the One true God, as to remember He is Three Perſons; and ſo worſhip the Three Perſons, as to bear in Mind that they are but one Subſtance, or Godhead, or God. So the Author explains himſelf in the next Articles, which are theſe;

"Neither confounding the Perſons, nor "dividing the Subſtance: for there is one "Perſon of the Father, another of the Son, "another of the Holy Ghoſt: But the God-"head of the Father, and of the Son, and "of the Holy Ghoſt, is all one. Therefore all theſe Articles make indeed but one Article, which is this; "The One true God is "*Three diſtinct Perſons*; and Three diſtinct "Perſons (Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt) "are the One true God.'

Plainly, as if a Man ſhould ſay, *Peter, James*, and *John*, being *Three Perſons*, are *One Man*; and One Man is theſe Three diſtinct Perſons, *Peter, James*, and *John*. Is it not now a Ridiculous Attempt, as well as a Barbarous Indignity, to go about thus to make Aſſes of all Mankind, under pretence of teaching them a Creed, and things Divine, to deſpoil them of their Reaſon, the Image of God, and the Character of our Nature? But let us, in two words, examine the parts of this Monſtrous Propoſition, as 'tis laid down in the Creed it ſelf.

"Neither confounding the Perſons, nor "dividing the Subſtance.

But how can we not confound the Perſons, that have (they ſay) but *One numerical Subſtance?* And how can we but divide the Subſtance, which we find in Three *diſtinct divided* Perſons?

"There is one Subſtance of the Father, "another of the Son, another of the Holy "Ghoſt.

Then the Son is not the Father, nor is the Father the Son, nor the Holy Ghoſt either of them. I ſhall not need to prove this Conſequence, not only becauſe 'tis evident, but becauſe 'tis acknowledged by the Trinitarians. But if the Father is not the Son, and yet is (by confeſſion of All) *the One true God*; then the Son is not the One true God, becauſe He is not the Father; the reaſon is ſelf-evident; for how can the Son be the One true God, *if he is not He who is the One true God?* After the ſame manner it may be proved, that (on the Athanaſian Principles) neither the Father nor Holy Spirit are, or can be God, or the One true God; for neither of them is the Son, who is the One true God according to *Athanaſius*, and all Trinitarians: For they all ſay, the Father is the One true God, the Son is the One true God, the Holy Ghoſt is

the One true God: Which is a threefold Contradiction, becauſe there is but One true God, and one of theſe Perſons is not the other. But if it be a Contradiction, 'tis certainly falſe; for every Contradiction being made up of Inconſiſtencies, deſtroys it ſelf, and *is its own Confutation.*

Creed. "The Godhead of the Father, "and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, is "all One; the Glory equal, the Majeſty co-"eternal.

Notes. The meaning of the laſt Clauſe is, That the Glory and Majeſty of the Son and Holy Spirit, is equal to the Glory and Majeſty of the Father; or the Son and Holy Spirit are equally Glorious and Majeſtical with God the Father.

Therefore I ask, Whether the Glory and Majeſty, with which the Son and Spirit are Glorious and Majeſtical, be *the ſame in Number* (that is, the very ſame) with which the Father is Glorious and Majeſtical; or only *the ſame for Kind and Degree?* If it be not the ſame *in Number*, then the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, is not (as this Creed teaches) *all One*; and they are not one and the ſame God: for two *Infinite and Diſtinct Glories* and *Majeſties*, make two Gods, and three make three Gods; as every one ſees, and (to ſay true) the Trinitarians themſelves confeſs. It remains therefore that, they ſay, the Glory and Majeſty of the Son and Spirit, is the ſame *in Number*, or Numerically the ſame, and not for Kind and Degree only, with that of the Father: but then it follows, that the Glory and Majeſty of theſe Perſons is *neither Equal nor Coeternal*, Not Equal, for 'tis the ſame, which Equals never are: nor Coeternal, for this alſo plainly intimates that they are Diſtinct; for how Coeternal, if not Diſtinct? Do we ſay, a thing is Coeternal or Contemporary with it ſelf? Therefore this Article doth alſo impugn and deſtroy it ſelf. Beſides, if the Glory and Majeſty of the Three Perſons be *numerically the ſame*, then ſo are all their other Attributes; from whence it follows, that there is no real Difference between the Three Perſons; and that they are only *three ſeveral Names of God*; which is the Hereſy of the Sabellians.

In the next place this Creed teaches, that "The Father is Incomprehenſible, Uncreate, "Eternal, Almighty; the Son is Incompre-"henſible, Uncreate, Eternal, Almighty; "the Holy Ghoſt is Incomprehenſible, Un-"create, Eternal, Almighty: Alſo that each "of theſe Perſons *by himſelf* is God and "Lord; ſo that the Father is God, the Son "is God, and the Holy Ghoſt is God: yet "there are not Three Gods or Lords, nor "Three Incomprehenſibles, nor Three Al-"mighties, nor Three Eternals or Uncre-"ated.

Now if in imitation of this, a Man ſhould have a mind to ſay; "The Father is a Per-"ſon, the Son is a Perſon, and the Holy "Ghoſt is a Perſon, yet there are *not Three* "*Perſons*, but one Perſon. I would know, why this were not as good *Grammar* and *Arithmetick*; as when *Athanaſius* ſays, the Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghoſt is God; yet *not Three Gods*, but one God: or when he ſays, the Father Uncreated, the Son Uncreated, the Holy Ghoſt Uncreated, yet *not Three Uncreated*, but one Uncreated, And ſo of the reſt.

Doth not a Man contradict himſelf, when the Term or Terms in his Negation, are the ſame with thoſe in his Affirmation? If not, then it may be true, that "the Father is "a Perſon, the Son is a Perſon, the Holy "Ghoſt is a Perſon; yet *there are not Three* "*Perſons*, but one Perſon: For all the fault here is only this, that in the laſt Clauſe the Term *Perſon* is *denied* to belong to more than One, when in the firſt it had been *affirmed* of no fewer than Three. For the ſame reaſon, it muſt be a Contradiction to ſay, "The Father is God, the Son is God, "the Holy Ghoſt is God, yet *there are not* "*three Gods*, but one God: for the Term *God* is at laſt *denied* to belong to more than One, tho in the firſt it was affirmed of Three. Will they ſay, that in theſe words, *there are not Three Gods, but One God?* the Term *God* is

is not denied to belong to more than One, or is not appropriated to One. If ſo, then *there are not Three Perſons, but One Perſon*; and again, *there are not Three Men, but One Man*: Then (I ſay) theſe Propoſitions do not deny the Terms *Perſon* and *Man* to belong to more than One, or appropriate them to One only; which yet every Body confeſſes they do.

But here is an Arithmetical, as well as Grammatical Contradiction. For in ſaying, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghoſt; yet not Three Gods, but One God: A Man firſt diſtinctly numbers Three Gods; and then in ſumming them up, *brutiſhly* ſays, not Three Gods, but One God.

To theſe things, it will perhaps be anſwered, That when we ſay, *God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghoſt*; or thus, *the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghoſt is God*: the Term *God* is uſed *Perſonally*: but when 'tis ſaid, *There are not Three Gods, but One God*: the Term *God* is uſed *Eſſentially*, and therefore comprehends the whole Three Perſons: ſo that there is neither *a Grammatical, nor Arithmetical Contradiction*. But this Remedy is worſe (if poſſible) than the Diſeaſe: for it owns that there are *Three Perſonal Gods*, though there is but *one Eſſential God*; and that otherways the Propoſitions of which we are ſpeaking, would imply all the aforeſaid Contradictions. This Remedy, I ſay, is worſe than the Diſeaſe. For, 1. Three Perſonal Gods, and one Eſſential God, make Four Gods; if the Eſſential God be not the ſame with the Perſonal Gods: and tho he is the ſame, yet ſince they are not the ſame with one another, but diſtinct, it follows, that there are Three Gods, that is, Three Perſonal Gods. 2. It introduces *two ſorts of True Gods*; Three Perſonal, and One Eſſential. But the Chriſtian Religion knows and owns but One True and moſt High God, of any ſort. And I would know of the Trinitarians, whether they dare ſay in expreſs words, *There are two ſorts of True Gods?*

Creed. "For like as we are *compelled* by "the Chriſtian Verity, to acknowledg every "Perſon *by himſelf* to be God and Lord, *&c.*

Notes. By the Chriſtian Verity, I ſuppoſe are meant, the Sacred Books which contain the Chriſtian Religion, that is, the Books of the Old and New Teſtaments. But do theſe Books, and do's that Verity *compel us* to the acknowledgment of Three Perſons, each of which is *by himſelf* Supream God and Lord, and yet all of them but One God? Doth, I ſay, the Holy Scripture *compel us* to this Contradictory Acknowledgment? Is there any Text alledged from Scripture, which all the Unitarians, and ſome or other of the moſt learned Trinitarians, do not eaſily interpret in ſuch ſenſe, that the Unity of God is preſerved; and no more than one Perſon (even the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt) acknowledged to be God? See the Hiſtory of the *Unitarians*. But if there is no Text of Scripture, but what is in the Opinion of ſome or other of their own Learned Men, fairly capable of a ſenſe contrary to the Faith delivered in this Creed: then we are *not compelled* to acknowledg this Faith. And the truth is, the Conteſt between the Unitarians and Trinitarians is not, as is commonly thought, *a Claſh of Reaſon with Scripture*: but it layeth here, Whether, when the Holy Scriptures may be underſtood as teaching only One God, or but One who is God, which agrees with the reſt of Scripture, and with Natural Reaſon; we muſt notwithſtanding, prefer an Interpretation of it which is abſurd, and contrary to it ſelf, to Reaſon, and to the reſt of Scripture, ſuch as the Trinitarian Interpretation (expreſt in this Creed) appears to be? In a word, the Queſtion only is, Whether we ought to interpret Holy Scripture when it ſpeaks of God, *according to Reaſon*, or not; that is, like Fools, or like Wiſe Men?

Creed. "The Son is of the Father alone; "not Made, nor Created, but Begotten.

Notes. Here, and in the next Period, *Athanaſius* is got into his *Altitudes*, or *Profanities*, which you will. Here 'tis that the

the Ignorant think, they are taught *the Inmoſt Secrets* of Theological Knowledg: but *High* and *Low* are no more contrary, than the things which are here affirmed as Equal Truths.

If the Creed-maker had ſpoke here of the Generation of the Son by the Divine Power on the Virgin *Mary*, it would have been true, that, *the Son is neither Made, nor Created, but Begotten:* but then the firſt part of the Article would be falſe, that *the Son is of the Father alone*; for He that has a Father, and a Mother, is *of Both*. But ſince He ſpeaks of the (pretended) *Eternal Generation*, the latter part of the Article is falſe, and inconſiſtent with the firſt part of it. Every Novice in Grammar, and proper ſpeaking, knows, that *Begotten*, when 'tis diſtinguiſhed from *Made* and *Created*, always ſuppoſes two Parents, a Mother as well as a Father: 'tis therefore a Contradiction to ſay, *the Son is of the Father alone, not Made, nor Created, but Begotten*; for if he is Begotten, he cannot be of the Father alone; and if He is of the Father alone, He is not Begotten, but *either Made, or Created*.

Creed. "The Holy Ghoſt is of the Fa-
"ther and of the Son; neither Made, nor
"Created, nor Begotten, but Proceeding.

Notes. The firſt fault here is, that the Holy Ghoſt is ſaid to proceed from the Father, *and from the Son*. To which Hereſy the Greek Church have ever oppoſed thoſe clear words, John 15. 26. *When the Comforter is come, whom I will ſend unto you* from the Father, *even the Spirit of Truth* which proceedeth from the Father, *He ſhall teſtify of me*.

Secondly, He ſaith here, that the Holy Ghoſt is *not Begotten, but Proceeding:* He adds ſhortly after, that *He who will be ſaved, muſt thus think of the Trinity:* Therefore ſurely *Begotten and Proceeding* differ very much, and very clearly; elſe 'tis an harſh Sentence, that we ſhall be damned if we do not conceive, beſides all other unconceivable Myſteries of this Creed, that the Holy Ghoſt is *not Begotten, but Proceeds*. Yet after all, 'tis confeſſed by the moſt Learned Trinitarians, that Begotten, and Proceeding, differ nothing at all; for they acknowledg that it is rightly ſaid, *The Son proceeds from the Father*, and that *the Holy Ghoſt is generated of Both*; directly contrary to this Creed. It follows, that *Athanaſius* has damned the whole World, for not diſtinguiſhing where no Diſtinction can be made, at leaſt with any certainty. And perhaps this Damning Humour of his, has *juſtly* provoked ſome to write him, not S. *Athanaſius*, but (drawing the *S* a little nearer) *Sathanaſius*.

Creed. "So there is One Father, not
"Three Fathers; One Son, not Three
"Sons; One Holy Ghoſt, not Three Holy
"Ghoſts.

Notes. In conſiſtence with what goes before, He ſhould have ſaid, Two Fathers; Two Sons; and Three Holy Ghoſts, or Spirits. For the Second Perſon is the Son of the Firſt, and the Third *proceeds* (which is nothing elſe but *is generated*) from the Firſt and Second, which makes Two Fathers, and Two Sons; and all Three of them are Holy Spirits; for the Father is an Holy Spirit, and ſo is the Son, no leſs than the Third Perſon. But this is not the firſt time in this Creed, that *Athanaſius* has diſcover'd *He could not count*.

Creed. "In this Trinity, none is Afore, or
"After other; none is Greater, or Loſs than
"another.

Notes. Yet the Son himſelf ſaith, *John* 14. 28. *My Father is greater than I.* And for the other Clauſe, *None is Afore or After other*; 'tis juſt as true as that there is no difference at all between Afore and After. I ask, Whether the Son doth not, *as He is a Son*, derive both Life and Godhead from the Father? All Trinitarians grant, He do's; grounding themſelves on the Nicene Creed, which expreſly calls the Son, *God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; Begotten, not Made*. But if the Father gave to the Son Life and Godhead; He muſt have both before he could communicate or give either of them to the Son, and conſequently was Afore the Son was. No Effect is ſo early

early as its Cauſe; for if it were, it ſhould not have needed, nor had that for its Cauſe. No Propoſition in *Euclid* is more certain or evident than this.

Creed. "The right Faith is, That we "believe and confeſs, that our Lord Jeſus "Chriſt, the Son of God, is both God and "Man.

Notes. Then the Lord Chriſt is *Two Perſons.* For as He is God, He is the ſecond Perſon of the (pretended) Trinity: and as He is Man (*a perfect Man*, as this Creed afterwards ſpeaks) He is alſo a Perſon: for a Rational Soul, vitally united to an Human Body, is a Perſon, if there be any ſuch thing as Perſon upon Earth; nay, 'tis the only thing upon Earth that is a Perſon. Let the *Athanaſians* therefore either ſay, that the Lord Chriſt *is two Perſons*; which is the Hereſy of *Neſtorius*, condemned in a General Council: Or, that He is *not a Man*, contrary to 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. *There is One God, and One Mediator between God and Man, the Man Jeſus Chriſt:* Or, that He is *not God*, which is the Truth.

Creed. "Who, altho He be God and "Man; yet He is not two, but one Chriſt. "One, not by Converſion of the Godhead "into Fleſh, but by taking of the Manhood "into God: One, not by Confuſion of Sub-"ſtance, but by Unity of Perſon.

Notes. But becauſe theſe words, *One, not by converſion of the Godhead into Fleſh, but by taking of the Manhood into God*; and again, *One, not by Confuſion of Subſtance, but Unity of Perſon*; cannot readily be underſtood by themſelves: the Creed-maker explains them in this following Article; *For as the Reaſonable Soul and Fleſh is one Man*; *ſo God and Man is one Chriſt:* That is, as a Soul united vitally to a Body, maketh one Perſon, called Man, without confounding the two Subſtances of Soul and Body; for the Soul remaineth what it was, and ſo alſo does the Body: So God the Son being united to a Reaſonable Soul and Body, doth, *together with them*, make one Perſon, called Chriſt, without confounding the Subſtances of the Divinity or Humanity; for the Divinity remains, without the leaſt Change, what it was, and and ſo doth the Humanity, or Reaſonable Soul and Body. This is the only Offer at Senſe, that is to be found in this whole Creed; but ſo far from explicating, that it farther perplexes the difficulty of the (pretended) Incarnation; as will appear by theſe two Conſiderations.

1. In the *Perſonal Union* of a Soul with a Body, the Union is between two Finite Things: but in *the* (pretended) *Perſonal Union* of God to Man, and Man to God, the Union is between Finite and Infinite; which (on the Principles of the Trinitarians) is impoſſible. For we muſt either ſuppoſe, that Finite and Infinite are Commenſurate, that is, Equal; which every one knows is falſe: or that the Finite is united but to ſome part of the Infinite, and *is disjoyned from the reſt*; which all Trinitarians deny and abhor.

You will ſay, If they admit neither of theſe, how do they ſhew the Poſſibility of the Incarnation, or Union of God to Man? They tell you, God indeed is Infinite, and every Reaſonable Soul and Body (even that of Chriſt) is Finite; yet the whole God and whole Man are united; becauſe, *As the whole Eternity of God doth coexiſt to a moment of Time; ſo the whole Immenſity of God is in every Mathematical Point of Space.* The very Truth is, they cannot otherways defend the Incarnation, or *Perſonal Union* of an Infinite God to a Finite Man: but withal it muſt be owned, that then the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation do infer, imply, and ſuppoſe all the Contradictions, that Mr. *Johnſon* has objected to the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, in that little Golden Tract, ſo deſervedly eſteemed by All. His whole Book and all his Demonſtrations are founded on theſe two Suppoſitions, that *a longer time doth not all of it coexiſt to a ſhorter; nor is a greater Extenſion conſtipated or contained in a leſs*, much leſs in a Mathematical Point. Therefore all his Book, and all that he hath ſo well ſaid and argued in the Preface concerning

cerning the Authority and Judicature of Reason in Matters of Religion, equally and effectually deſtroys the Doctrines of the Trinity and Tranſubſtantiation. If the Reader would have an excellent Book, let him procure that. But Oh! were the Preſs as free for the Unitarians as 'tis for other Proteſtants; how eaſily would they make it appear, that the Follies and Contradictions ſo juſtly charged on Tranſubſtantiation, are neither for Number, Conſequence, nor Clearneſs, any way comparable to thoſe implied in the *Athanaſian* Creed; and that the Trinity hath the ſame, and no other Foundation with Tranſubſtantiation; ſo that we muſt of neceſſary admit both or neither. If *the Church* is to interpret Scripture for us, we muſt admit both; but if *Reaſon*, we can admit neither, and this (I think) the Trinitarians will not deny.

But ſecondly, In the (pretended) Incarnation or Union of God with Man, the Union cannot be *Perſonal*, as 'tis between the Soul and Body; it cannot, I mean, be ſuch an Union as to make but one Perſon. The Union of the Soul and Body may be properly Perſonal, that is, may conſtitute or make one Perſon; becauſe 'tis not the Union of two Perſons, but only of one Perſon (the Soul) to a thing otherways without Life, Reaſon, Memory, or Free-will. The Body is but as it were the Garment of the Soul, and is wholly acted by it, and depending on it. But in the (pretended) Union of God with Man, there are two diſtinct and very different Lives, Reaſons, Memories and Free-wills: which utterly deſtroys a Perſonal Union; for that ſuppoſes but one Life, one Reaſon, one Memory, one Free-will: for if theſe things which conſtitute a Perſon, are found more than once, there is no longer one Perſon, but two, and conſequently no Perſonal Union in the ſenſe of which we are ſpeaking.

Creed. "This is the Catholick Faith; "which except a Man believe faithfully, he "cannot be ſaved.

Notes. By *Believing*, *Athanaſius* doth not mean *bare* Believing, but he includeth alſo therein *Profeſſion:* for he ſaith a little before, *The right Faith is, that we Believe and Confeſs*, &c. So that a Man cannot be ſaved, unleſs he Believes and *Profeſſes* as this Creed directs him.

Firſt, For *Believing*. *What if a Man cannot believe it?* Are we obliged under the Penalty of the loſs of Salvation, to believe it, whether we can or no? Doth God require of any Man *an Impoſſible Condition*, in order to Salvation?

Secondly, As for *Profeſſing* under pain of Damnation. *What if it be againſt a Man's Conſcience to profeſs it?* The Scripture ſaith, *Whatſoever is not of Faith, is Sin:* if therefore a Man profeſſes againſt his Conſcience, he ſins; and if notwithſtanding this, a Man muſt either profeſs, or be damned, then God requires *ſome Men* to ſin in order to their Salvation: but this we are ſure is falſe, and therefore that the Menace in the Article is vain.

And now I appeal to all Men, that have any freedom of Judgment remaining; Whether this Creed is fit to be retained in any Chriſtian, much leſs Proteſtant and Reformed Church? Since it ſubverts the Foundations, not only of Chriſtianity, but of all Religion; that is to ſay, of Reaſon and Revelation: there being no Principle in Reaſon and Scripture more evident, than that *God is One*; or that there is one Almighty, only-Wiſe and Good Perſon, or Father of all. If we cannot be ſure of this, then Religion and Chriſtianity are built upon Fancy only, and have no ſolid Foundation.

This Creed may be profeſſed by the Roman Political Church; becauſe it gives countenance to their Abſurd Tranſubſtantiation, and Cunning Traditions added to Scripture; as thoſe Doctrines do to the gaining of Veneration, and conſequently Dominion and Riches to their Clergy: But in a Reformed Church, where the Scripture is held to be *a compleat Rule* of Faith and Manners; and alſo to be Clear and Plain in

all

all things neceſſary to Salvation, even to the meaneſt Underſtanding, that reads it or hears it with Sobriety and Attention; ſuch a Confeſſion of Faith is (I think) intolerable, as being utterly inconſiſtent with thoſe Principles, and reducing us back to the Roman Bondage.

Beſides, Nothing has been or is more ſcandalous to Jews and Mahometans, than this Creed, the chief Article of whoſe Religion it is, that *there is one onely God*. The Evidence of which Principle is ſuch in Nature, as well as Scripture, that it has propagated Mahometiſm among greater Numbers, than at this Day own Chriſtianity: For the ſake of that one Truth, ſo many Nations have ſwallowed all the Errors and Follies of the *Alcoran*, or Book of *Mahomet*; as on the other Hand, Chriſtianity has been rejected and deteſted among them, on the account of the Vulgar Chriſtians *Three Perſons, who are ſeverally and each of them God*.

But the Miſchiefs of this Creed do not ſtay here, it is levelled not only againſt the true Faith, but is alſo deſtructive of that Love and Charity, which is the Spirit and Life of Chriſtianity; and without which, Faith is but a *Lifeleſs Body*. For as if it would effectually inſpire all its Believers with a Spirit of Judging, Damning, and Uncharitableneſs; it pronounces the Sentence of Eternal Damnation, in the Beginning, Middle and Concluſion, upon all that do not both Believe and Profeſs this Faith, and keep it *Whole* and *Undefiled*; that is, upon the whole *Greek Church*, and other Churches in *the Eaſt*; and upon at leaſt five parts of ſix of all that profeſs Chriſtianity in the World, whoſe Underſtandings cannot poſſibly reach to the Senſe and Coherence, which ſome pretend to find in this Creed.

Thus the Chriſtian Religion is deſtroyed, in both the Eſſential Parts of it, *Faith* and *Love*. Hence have proceeded many and endleſs Controverſies and Wars among Chriſtians: and at length the more Fierce and Violent, the more Deceitful and Sophiſtical Part, have attained a Tyrannical Domination over their Oppoſers; and have introduced and ſettled, a Chriſtianity ſhall I call it, or, *a Superſtition*, or *a Polity*, quite contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of our Bleſſed Lord, and his Apoſtles ?

THE Notes upon the Creed of *Athanaſius* have been already printed by themſelves, and were received and approved by ſeveral Learned Men, both of *London* and in the Country. Dr. *Sherlock* has thought fit to oppoſe to them a large Book, in which at *Pag.* 142. he ſaith, *My Undertaking is to vindicate the Athanaſian Creed, and the Doctrine of a Trinity in Unity.*

Yet in this *Vindication*, he hath given up to his Adverſary, all the ancient Defences of this Creed and of the Trinity; on which his Predeceſſors in this Controverſy were wont to inſiſt; and has advanced in their room, an Hypotheſis or Explication, never ſo much as named or heard of before. He pretends to ſalve by theſe two words, *Self-conſciouſneſs* and *Mutual-conſciouſneſs*, all the Difficulties of this Great Myſtery; ſo ſufficiently and evidently, that the Notion of a Trinity in Unity, *is now* (He ſaith) *as clear and eaſy, as that of but One God*. But this is too much for any Man to take on his bare word, or without carefully examining what He has ſaid.

1. Concerning the Divine Subſtance, Nature, or Eſſence: for in this Queſtion theſe are Equivalent Terms, both with the Vindicator, and with the Author of the Notes.

2. How doth he deſcribe the *Three* Perſons; and how is each Perſon *one with it ſelf*; and how are they *diſtinguiſhed* each from other.

3. How are they *united with one another*; and how do they All make one God.

First; *Concerning the Divine Subſtance, or Eſſence, or Nature.*

In his Diſcourſes concerning the Divine Subſtance, or Eſſence; the Vindicator ſeems ſometimes to be a perfect *Hobbiſt*, to deny all Spiritual and Immaterial Subſtance; or that there is any other Subſtance but *Matter*, or Body.

He ſaith (for example) at *Pag. 69. We can frame no Idea of Subſtance, but what we have from Matter.* When we conceive of God as a Subſtance (he ſaith there) *We find it impoſſible to conceive, how there ſhould be Three Divine Perſons, without Three diſtinct Infinite Subſtances.—A Perſon and an Intelligent Subſtance are Reciprocal Terms; and therefore Three diſtinct Perſons, are three diſtinct Numerical Subſtances; and one Numerical Subſtance, is but one Numerical Perſon.* He ſays, that theſe are all Carnal Reaſonings, which ariſe from our conceiving of God as *a Subſtance*; of which we can have no Idea, but what is *Material*. He concludes in the ſame place, and often elſewhere, *We muſt not ſeek for any other Subſtance in God, but Infinite Power, Wiſdom and Goodneſs.* But as if he had been a little too liberal in that, he ſays, at *P.72. Wiſdom and Truth are the true Nature and Eſſence* (or Subſtance) *of God.* He often exhorts his Reader, particularly at *P. 70. To ſet aſide all theſe Material Images of Eſſence and Subſtance; and to contemplate God as Eternal Truth and Wiſdom, and then the Notion of God is very plain and eaſy.* He adds, at *P. 138. That which has confounded this Myſtery* (of the Trinity) *has been the vain Endeavour of reducing it to Terms of Art, ſuch as Nature, Eſſence, Subſtance, Subſiſtence, Perſon, Hypoſtaſis, and the like.*

He preſumes to ſay, at *P.139. The Fathers nicely diſtinguiſhed between Hypoſtaſis or Perſon, and Nature, or Eſſence, or Subſtance; ſaying, that there are Three Perſons, and but one Nature or Eſſence, or Subſtance. But then, when Men curiouſly examined the ſignification of theſe words, they found, that upon ſome account or other, they were unapplicable to this Myſtery. For what is the Subſtance and Nature of God? How can Three diſtinct Perſons have but one Numerical Subſtance? What is the diſtinction between Eſſence and Perſonality?*

Now I ask, Is this to *vindicate the Athanaſian Creed*, as the Doctor undertook to do; or to ſlight and overthrow it? The chief Buſineſs of the *Athanaſian* Creed, is to diſtinguiſh between the *Subſtance* and *Perſons* in God, to ſhow that the Perſons are Three, and the Subſtance but One. The Vindicator could not have more effectually given up the Catholick Doctrine to the Note-maker, than by thus frequently denying, there is any real Divine Subſtance at all, (which is more than his Adverſary required, and than he will accept) and by ſaying, Men have unduly uſed theſe Terms by their applying them to God. The pretence of the Brief Notes is no other, but what the Vindicator (we have ſeen) often grants: that there is no difference between Subſtance and Perſon in God; and that therefore Three Divine Perſons and One Divine Subſtance, is a ſenſleſs Contradiction.

But then 'tis as ſenſleſs to deny the Divine Subſtance, and to reduce the whole Notion of God to *Wiſdom and Truth*; for theſe are Properties that cannot ſubſiſt, but in ſome Subſtance. Nor do I think, that the Trinitarians will forgo their old Explications, by *Perſons* and *Subſtance*; for the Doctor's *new Wind-mills* of Self-conſciouſneſs and Mutual-conſciouſneſs. They will certainly abide by the Nicene and Athanaſian Creeds, which ſuppoſe a Real Divine Subſtance, in which do ſubſiſt Three Divine Perſons. It will be always Hereſy with them, to deny *Homo-ouſios*, or that Chriſt is *of Like and Equal Subſtance* with the Father.

I muſt not diſmiſs the Conſideration of the Vindicator's Doctrine, about the Divine Subſtance, without noting, that his Contradictions to himſelf, are as frequent as his Heterodoxies. For tho he has ſpoken ſo often, ſo expreſly, and ſo much, againſt Subſtance and Perſons in God: yet when *the Metaphyſical*

ſical Humour is upon him, he talks of theſe as of moſt Certain and Real Things. He ſays at *P.* 47. *The Three Perſons are Three Real Subſtantial Beings.* And again, *The Three Perſons are ſubſtantially diſtinct.* Now this is to ſay, the Three Perſons are Three diſtinct Subſtances: for that is the only poſſible meaning of, *Three Real Subſtantial Beings, ſubſtantially diſtinct.* Thus God at laſt is not only *a Subſtance*, but he is Three Real diſtinct Subſtances. This was the Hereſy of *Valentinus Gentilis*, that the Three Perſons are *Tres Spiritus ſubſtantiali numero differentes.* I wiſh the Vindicator better Succeſs with his Doctrine, than *Valentinus* met at *Geneva* and *Berne.* But the moſt pleaſant of all is, that after the Vindicator had there ſaid, *The Three Divine Perſons are ſubſtantially diſtinct*; he immediately ſubjoyns, *tho in one Undivided Subſtance.* Is it poſſible a Man ſhould give ſo little heed to what he ſays in ſo Great and Nice a Queſtion? He has not *a ſenſible* Friend in the World, that will not tell him, that 'tis as much as to ſay, *The Perſons are Three diſtinct Subſtances, and yet are but one Undivided Subſtance.* The firſt alone is Hereſy, the other ſuperadded to it, makes a groſs Contradiction. But there are greater Matters, about which I muſt ſpeak with the Vindicator.

Secondly; *Of the Perſons, their Unity, and their Diſtinction.*

As to the Divine Perſons, and the Unity or Oneneſs of each Perſon with it ſelf, and its Diſtinction from the other two Perſons; he ſays as follows.

Pag. 67. 'A Perſon is ſuch a Being, as 'has Underſtanding, Will, and Power of 'Action.

P. 66. 'They are Three diſtinct and In-'finite Minds.——Three Intelligent Beings.

P. 258. 'They are Three Holy Spirits.

P. 67. 'Theſe Three Infinite Minds are 'diſtinguiſhed *juſt as* Three Finite Created 'Minds are, *by Self-conſciouſneſs.*—Each Di-'vine Perſon has a Self-conſciouſneſs of its 'own, and knows and feels it ſelf, as diſtinct 'from the other Divine Perſons. The Fa-'ther has a Self-conſciouſneſs of his own, 'whereby he knows and feels himſelf to be 'the Father, and not the Son or Holy Ghoſt; 'The Son feels himſelf to be the Son, and 'not the Father or Holy Ghoſt. The Holy 'Ghoſt feels himſelf to be the Holy Ghoſt, 'and not the Father or Son.

P. 104. 'The Perſons are *as really* diſtinct, 'as Three Humane Perſons, or Three Men 'are.

P. 105. 'Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt 'are *as really* diſtinct Perſons, as *Peter, James* 'and *John.*

P. 149. 'We muſt believe Three diſtinct 'Divine Perſons, each of which is God.

P. 98. 'We muſt allow each Perſon to be 'a God. So alſo at *P.* 47. and elſewhere.

He not only contends each Perſon is God, and *a* God, but 'tis his Belief (in ſome places of his Vindication) that each Perſon is a moſt conſummate and *abſolutely perfect* God: For he aſcribes to each of them a Perſonal *abſolutely perfect* Wiſdom, Goodneſs, Juſtice and Power. I ſay, *a perſonal* perfect Wiſdom, *&c.* beſides the Wiſdom, Goodneſs, *&c.* common to them all by their *Mutual-conſciouſneſs.* His Words are theſe:

P. 81. 'There is no Contradiction, that 'three Infinite Minds ſhould be *abſolutely* 'perfect, in Wiſdom, Goodneſs and Power; 'for theſe are Perfections that may be in 'more than One.

P. 84, 85. 'The Father has his own *Per-'ſonal Wiſdom*, and by Internal Conſciouſneſs, 'all the Wiſdom of the Son and Holy Ghoſt. 'The Son has his own Perſonal Wiſdom, and 'by the ſame Conſciouſneſs, the Wiſdom of 'the Father and Holy Ghoſt. The Holy Ghoſt 'has his own Perſonal Wiſdom, and all the 'Wiſdom of the Father and Son.

At *P.* 78. He denies there is in God an Infinite Wiſdom, Goodneſs, Power, *&c.* but only perfect Wiſdom, Goodneſs, *&c.*

He acknowledges at *P.* 97. and frequently elſe-where; that if the Divine Perſons

were *distinct and separate* Persons, they would be Three Gods: but they are, he saith, distinct, but *not separate* Persons: Yet he saith there, each of these Persons is *μοναδικῶς singly* and *by himself*, God, though not separately God.

P. 48. 'A Finite Spirit's Numerical One-'ness can be nothing else, but every Spirit's 'Unity with it self, and its distinct and se-'parate Subsistence from all other Created 'Spirits. And this *Self-unity* can be nothing 'else but *Self-consciousness*; or that it is con-'scious to its own Thoughts, Reasons, Passi-'ons, *&c.* which no other Finite Created 'Spirit is conscious to, but it self.

Let us put this remarkable Doctrine concerning the Three Divine Persons into a short Creed, and then make *Brief Notes* upon it.

Dr. Sherlock's *Creed.*

"I Believe there are Three distinct Intel-"ligent Infinite Beings, Minds, Spirits, "and Persons; distinguished *just as* Three "Finite Created Minds or Spirits are, *as* "*really* distinct as three Men, or as *Peter*, "*James* and *John:* Each of them has a "*Self-consciousness*, whereby he knows and "feels himself, as really distinct from the "other two Divine Persons. Also each of "them has his own *absolutely perfect* (for "there is *no Infinite*) Wisdom, Goodness, "and Power: and by *a Mutual-consciousness*, "each Person of these has the whole Wis-"dom, Power and Goodness of the two "other Persons. Each Person has his own "Understanding, Will, and Power of Acti-"on. Finally, each of these Beings, Minds, "Spirits, Persons, is God, nay each of them "singly *by himself* is *a* God.

This Creed is not only the Vindicator's Sense, but his very Words, which he has often repeated in his Book. Let us deliberately, and minutely consider, whether it be the Faith of Christians, or consistent with Scripture or Reason?

I believe there are Three Infinite Spirits, Minds and Beings. 'Tis the first time I ever heard so in my Life: That God is *unum summum Ens, one Supream Being*; that he is *Animus, Mens, Spiritus,* Πνεῦμα, Νοῦς, *a Mind, a Spirit,* is the Voice not only of Scripture, but the agreed Doctrine of all Christians. Let the Vindicator shew me, either in Holy Scripture, or in any Catholick Writer, that these words are used of God in the Plural Number. Do any of them, like this Doctor, call God *Animi Mentes,* Πνεύματα, *Minds, Spirits, Beings?* Himself is the first who has dared thus to speak in express words; and the reason is, because he saw not what they all saw, that three Infinite Minds, Spirits, or Beings, are Three Gods: For if one Infinite Mind, or Spirit, is One God, Three Infinite Minds, must be Three Gods; else we cannot distinguish between One and Three; nor discern, that the Definition being multiplied, the thing defined is also multiplied.

God, saith our Saviour (at *Joh.* 4. 24.) is *a* Spirit. No, saith the Vindicator (at *p.* 258, and *p.* 66.) God is *Three* Spirits, Minds, or Beings; and to teach the contrary, *is both Heresy and Non-sense.* Before a Man bestows such Complements, he ought well to consider on whom they may reflect: for tho he thinks, that such as *Socinus*, and the Note-maker deserve not, that common Humanity and good Manners be shown them; yet he should have had some regard for his Saviour.

Well; but what if Holy Mother *Church* be in the same Nonsense and Heresy? Mr. *Savage*, who has also written against the Brief Notes, will tell him (at *p.* 4. of his Answer) that the Lateran Council hath defined, that the Three Divine Persons are *not Three Beings*, but that *all together they make* Unum summum Ens, *One Being.* And I will tell him, that the fourth Council of *Lateran* often repeats it, that God is not *Aliud & Aliud, more Beings or Things*; but *Una quædam Res, One Thing or Being.* Mr. *Marlow* in his late Book concerning the Trinity, written

(as

(as ſhould ſeem by the Preface) on occaſion of the Brief Hiſtory and Brief Notes, deſcribeth God at *p.* 64. *One ſingle Being*, he adds there, *More than one Infinite Being cannot ſubſiſt.* But it were endleſs to cite particular Authorities in this matter: therefore in a word, all Catechiſms, Syſtems, Inſtitutions of Theology, Chriſtian Writers (and even Jews and Mahometans) that have ſpoken of God, do with our Saviour, define him *a* Spirit, one Mind, one Being; never three Spirits, three Minds, or three Beings.

I dare not ask it of the Vindicator, becauſe he always anſwers according to the preſent Exigence only; but I would ask any other learned and ſenſible Man, What is *the adequate Notion*, or true definition of Three Gods? I make no doubt, every ſuch Perſon would anſwer without any the leaſt Heſitation; three Infinite Spirits, or Minds, or Intelligent Beings, are three Gods: Which is the Vindicator's Definition of one God.

But to involve himſelf yet more; he believes, *Theſe Three Infinite Spirits, Minds, Beings and Perſons, are diſtinguiſh'd juſt as Three Finite Created Minds, or Spirits are; they are as really diſtinct as three Men, or as* Peter, James *and* John. This is Polytheiſm, or *Plurality of Gods* with a witneſs. 'Tis as groſs Polytheiſm, as the Greeks or Romans were ever guilty of. If a Man had asked the Greek Philoſophers, ſuppoſe *Porphyrie* and *Hieroclis*, What Conception we ought to have of the three great Objects of Grecian Worſhip, *Jupiter*, *Neptune*, and *Pluto*? They would have anſwered, as the Vindicator does concerning his Trinity, they are three Divine Beings, Minds, or Spirits, diſtinguiſhed *as really*, and *juſt as* three Men, or as *Peter*, *James* and *John*. This was their Polytheiſm: not that they believ'd or worſhipped a falſe God, for that was *ſimple Idolatry*, but that they diſtinguiſh'd the Divinity into three or more Minds, and Beings *as really* and *juſt as* they diſtinguiſhed three Men, or as *Peter*, *James* and *John*.

The Vindicator will not be able to give a Rational and Intelligible Account, why it ſhould not as much be Polytheiſm in him to diſtinguiſh *as really*, and *juſt as* the Heathens did. It will not excuſe him, to ſay, that *Jupiter*, *Neptune* and *Pluto*, were but ſuppoſed Divine Perſons, but his are really Divine Perſons; for granting ſo much to him for this time, yet to miſtake the Object of their Faith and Worſhip, was only Idolatry; their Polytheiſm conſiſted in diſtinguiſhing the Object of Worſhip, the Divinity, into more Minds or Beings *as really*, and *juſt as* the three Men, *Peter*, *James* and *John* are diſtinguiſh'd.

Therefore the more Learned Trinitarians have been ſo far from ſaying, the three Divine Perſons are diſtinguiſh'd *juſt as Peter*, *James* and *John*, that they never durſt ſay, they are *really* diſtinct, but modally; ſomething more diſtinguiſh'd, (they ſay) between one another, than from their common Eſſence; yet not *really* diſtinct. They conſidered that real Diſtinction makes Alterity and Diverſity; but the Unity of God does not permit that he ſhould be *Alter*, *Another*, either from Himſelf, or from any thing that is Himſelf. Since the Eſſence of a thing is *that*, *by which it is what it is*; whatſoever things are really diſtinct things, muſt alſo be eſſentially diſtinct; but now the three Divine Perſons having but One Numerical Undivided Eſſence, by Confeſſion of all Trinitarians; therefore they cannot be Eſſentially diſtinct, and therefore not Really, but Modally only. I ſuppoſe therefore the Vindicator's Friends will prevail with him, to abate (in his next) very much of his *as really diſtinct*, and *diſtinguiſhed juſt as* theſe three Men, *Peter*, *James* and *John*.

Each of theſe Divine Perſons has a Self-conſciouſneſs, whereby He knows and feels himſelf as diſtinct from the other two Divine Perſons. This Aſſertion implies what he afterwards adds, that *each of them has his own proper Underſtanding, Will, and Power of Action.* Now I ſay, this is ſo great and clear an Alterity, or Diverſity, that no greater can be ſuppoſed between any ſort of Intelligent Beings.

God

God and his Creatures are not more truly *divers*, than by having each their own proper Understandings, Wills, and Powers of Action, and by really Being, and Knowing, and Feeling themselves as distinct from one another.

Intelligent Beings may indeed be farther *differenced* by Essential Perfections, or by Degrees of Perfection in the same Nature; as Angels are differenced from Men by Essential Perfections, and *Peter* from *John* by Degrees of Human Perfection, and God from his Creatures both by Essential Perfections, and by Degrees of those Perfections that are common to him and them: But the meer Alterity or *Diversity* of Intelligent Beings, or Minds, is no other but what the Vindicator has imputed to the Divine Persons themselves; namely that each such Being has his own Understanding, Will and Power of Action; and both is and knows himself as really distinct from all others. Persons or Spirits so distinct are as really *divers*, or are no more one another, than the Angel *Michael* is the Man *Peter*; or than *Peter* is *Charles*, the Lion in the Tower.

The Vindicator has discoursed all along so inconsequently, that I have no hopes he can advert to a Demonstration, that requires any Attention of Mind: but I cannot doubt that others of his Party will readily own, he has very much overshot himself; and that there cannot be such Alterity or Diversity in God, the most simple of all Beings. Can there be any thing in God as divers and distinct, as *Michael* and *Peter*; nay, as God and his Creatures? They will not say it; for 'tis to deny his Simplicity and Unity, and to compound him not only of several and divers Parts, but of divers and several Beings, which is too manifestly both Heterodox and Impossible. Can He be *most Simple and Uncompounded*, who is made up of three distinct Understandings, Wills, and Powers of Action; and who is constituted of three Beings, or Minds, that know and feel themselves distinct from one another, as distinct as *Michael* and *Peter*, and even as God and his Creatures? If so, then it may also be said, that *God and his Creatures are One most Simple Uncompounded Being*. That is the next Paradox the Vindicator has to defend. As for his Mutual consciousness, I shall demonstrate in its proper place, that it does not only not heal these Breaches, but incurably widens them, because (I shall shew) 'tis so far from being, or effecting any real Unity and Simplicity, that it implieth and supposeth an Essential Diversity, and a separate Existence of the Three Persons.

Also, each of these Persons has his own Personal absolutely perfect (*for there is no Infinite*) *Wisdom, Power and Goodness, and by a Mutual-consciousness, each of them has all the Wisdom, Power, and Goodness of the two other Persons.* This is still somewhat a clearer Explication of his Doctrine of Three God's, than any we have yet had: For since each of these Spirits, Minds, or Beings has his own Personal *absolutely perfect* Wisdom, Power and Goodness; and that besides the Consciousness and Sensation of the *absolutely perfect* Wisdom, Power, *&c.* of the other two; there can be nothing wanting to make each Person of them *an absolutely perfect God*. If there be indeed three *really distinct* Spirits, or Persons, each of which has his own Personal absolutely perfect Wisdom, *&c.* and therefore is an absolutely perfect God, I doubt whether there be a Man in the World (besides the Vindicator) who will not acknowledg upon that Supposition, that there are three really distinct and absolutely perfect Gods. But as far as he seems to be sunk in his Incogitance, I will put to him one Argument.

'Tis the most general and allowed Proof that there is but One God; because one God, or one Infinite Wisdom, Power, and Goodness, is sufficient, as sufficient as a thousand; and there cannot be in God any thing *that is needless, useless, or in vain*. Therefore I say, If any one of the Vindicator's Divine Spirits, Minds, Beings, or Persons, as suppose *the Father* has *a Personal* Infinite (or absolutely perfect) Wisdom, Power and Goodness, there can be no need or

occa-

occaſion for any other Divine Mind, Spirit, Being, or Perſon; more ſuch Minds were *needleſs, uſeleſs, and in vain.* And from hence it clearly follows, that the Unitarians have *the very ſame Evidence*, that there is but one abſolutely perfect Mind, Spirit, Being and Perſon, and but one abſolutely perfect Wiſdom, Power and Goodneſs, that there is for but One God.

And whereas Mutual-conſciouſneſs makes *the Beginning, Middle and End* of Dr. *Sherlock*'s Anſwer to the Brief Notes; I would know, of what uſe it can be? What Perfection can it be to any of the three Divine Perſons, to be conſcious to the other two, when nothing is gained by it, no Wiſdom, no Power, no Goodneſs? For without ſuch Mutual-conſciouſneſs, each Perſon has *his own Perſonal* abſolutely perfect Wiſdom, Power and Goodneſs. The Vindicator has found out a new Attribute in God, Mutual-conſciouſneſs, but will never be able to tell how 'tis any Perfection: Nay, it ſeemeth to be an Imperfection; for to know the ſame things over and over and over by Mutual-conſciouſneſs, which were before fully known by Self-conſciouſneſs, is the ſame in Knowledg, that *Tautology* is in Speech; they are both needleſs Repetitions, and therefore the firſt can no more be in God, than the other in wiſe Men.

At *p.* 78, and 79. he contends, that 'tis not well ſaid, that God is *an infinite* Being, or Spirit, or has *Infinite* Wiſdom, Juſtice, Power or Goodneſs; becauſe no Being can know what is not to be known; no Goodneſs or Juſtice can go beyond the meaſure, that is, can do exceſſive or unjuſt things; no Power can do impoſſible things. But this is a weak Allegation, tho he propoſes it with his uſual Confidence and Diſdain, to bear him out in this new and impious Hereſy, that the Perfections of God are not Infinite. For things Unjuſt or Exceſſive are not the Objects of Goodneſs or Juſtice; and 'tis as Ridiculous as 'tis Heretical, to pretend that the Goodneſs and Juſtice of God cannot be Infinite, becauſe He cannot do things that are either Exceſſive or Unjuſt; for this is a chief Reaſon why we aſcribe to God Infinite Goodneſs and Juſtice, even becauſe he can do nothing at all that is Exceſſive or Unjuſt. I cannot doubt, but that upon ſecond thoughts, the Vindicator himſelf will diſcern, that it was ſillily urged, *The Juſtice of God is not Infinite, becauſe He cannot do unjuſt things.* As for things *not knowable* and *not poſſible*, they are *Nullities*, and no more the Objects of Wiſdom and Power, or of any other Faculty, than things Unjuſt are of Juſtice; and therefore 'tis as vainly and impertinently required, that God ſhould know or do ſuch things by his Infinite Wiſdom and Power, as that He ſhould do unjuſt things by his Infinite Juſtice.

But I will farther tell this Oppoſer of the Divine Perfections, why it is ſaid the Goodneſs, Juſtice, Wiſdom, and Power of God are each of them Infinite. It is ſo ſaid, becauſe there is in God an inexhauſtible Fountain of Goodneſs and Juſtice; that is, he hath an indefectible Propenſity, and an Infinite Inclination of doing always and to all that which is juſt and good. Alſo the things he knoweth, and which he has and can do, being innumerable and without End, his Wiſdom and Power are alſo Infinite, or without End.

Finally, *He believes each of theſe Things, Minds, Spirits, Perſons, is God, nay, each of them ſingly by himſelf is a God.* He grants, and ſays, at *p.* 87, and 97. That if the Divine Perſons were *ſeparate* Perſons as well as diſtinct Perſons, they were without doubt three Gods. But now are not they ſeparate Perſons, each of which is ſingly and *by himſelf* a Perſon, and God; for what is a ſeparate Perſon, or a ſeparate God, but he who ſingly and *by himſelf* is a Perſon or God? *Single, ſeparate*, and *by himſelf*, are equivalent Terms with all Men but the Vindicator. *By himſelf* is the very Engliſh of the Latin *ſeparatus*, or ſeparate; therefore in ſaying here, that each Perſon *by himſelf* is God, he hath granted that each Perſon is *ſeparately* God; which is the thing he all along denies and abhors,

abhors, as a giving up the Queſtion to his Adverſary.

But he ſays expreſly, each of theſe Perſons is *a* God. None of his Party ever ſaid ſo; they will ſay each of theſe Perſons is God, or is *the* God, becauſe each of them has the Divine Eſſence, which is common to all three; but that each Perſon is *a* God, is without doubt an heretical Form of Speech, and neceſſarily introduces three Gods. For *the* before a Subſtantive, denotes the Unity of the thing ſpoken of, but *a* always ſuppoſes more things of the ſame kind. Thus we ſay *the* Sun, *the* Moon, *the* Earth, becauſe there is but one Sun, one Moon, one Earth; and for the ſame reaſon we ſay *God*, or *the* God; but we ſay *a* Spirit, *a* Man, *a* Perſon, becauſe there are more Spirits, Men, and Perſons. Therefore he that ſays, there are three Perſons, each of which is *a* God; or that ſays, the Father is *a* God, or the Son is *a* God, or the Holy Ghoſt is *a* God; ſuch an one (I ſay) profeſſes to believe more Gods. I appeal in this matter to all learned Men, of what Perſwaſion ſoever; and even to all who do but underſtand Grammar. But I muſt profeſs my wonder, that ſome Trinitarians in ther Explications of their (ſuppoſed) Trinity, are no more careful of avoiding ſuch open *Polytheiſm*, it being a Guilt next to Atheiſm.

Thirdly; *Of the Unity of the Perſons, and how they make but one God.*

Laſt of all; As to the Unity of the three Divine Perſons with one another, and how they all make but one God: He largely deſcribeth it in his 4*th* Section, from *Pag.* 46, to *p.* 86. But the ſum of all is this.

'A Finite Spirit's Unity or Oneneſs with 'it ſelf, is no other thing but its *Self-conſciouſ-'neſs*, or that it knows and feels its own 'Thoughts, Actions, and Paſſions. But if 'either Finite or Infinite Spirits, Minds, or 'Perſons are mutually conſcious; that is, 'are *internally and univerſally conſcious* to one 'anothers Thoughts, Wills, Actions, and 'Paſſions, this maketh them to be *truly and* '*properly Numerically One Spirit*; for (*p.* 49.) 'they are hereby as much one with each o-'ther, as every Spirit is one with himſelf; 'and (*p.* 56.) they are hereby united to 'each other, as every Man is to himſelf. 'To make three Spirits, or Perſons numeri-'cally one, it is not enough, that one of 'them is perfectly conſcious to all the reſt: 'they muſt all of them be mutually conſci-'ous; that is, each of them perfectly con-'ſcious to all the reſt. Thus God is con-'ſcious to all his Creatures, to all their 'Thoughts, Actions, and Paſſions, as fully 'conſcious as themſelves are; but they are 'not hereby made one with him, becauſe 'they not being conſcious to his Knowledg 'and Will, there is *not a Mutual-conſciouſneſs* 'between God and them. The Mutual 'conſciouſneſs of the three Divine Perſons, 'is the *Perichóreſis* and *Circumincеſſion* men-'tioned by the Fathers and the Schools. 'For *Perichóreſis*, or that the Father is in 'the Son and Spirit, and the Son in the Fa-'ther and Spirit, and the Spirit in the Fa-'ther and Son, is nothing elſe but their uni-'verſal Mutual-conſciouſneſs. We ought not 'to etertain a groſs material Idea of the '*Perichóreſis*, as if the three diſtinct Divine 'Perſons were in one another by a mutual 'Contract of Parts, for they have no Parts; '*the only Union and Perichóreſis* of Minds and 'Spirits is, that they are conſcious each to 'others Thoughts and Wills, as perfectly 'and inwardly as to their own. And thus 'alſo it is, that the three Divine Perſons are 'one God; they are one God, and in one 'another *by perfect Mutual-conſciouſneſs*.

The Vindicator often ſays, that this Explication of the Trinity, maketh a Trinity in Unity as eaſy and intelligible as the Notion of One God, or but one who is God. But being aware that 'tis not enough that an Explication be intelligible, if it be not alſo the true Explication; therefore he pretends to prove this Mutual-conſciouſneſs of the Father, Son, and Spirit, from *Joh.* 1. 18. & 10. 15, 30. 38. & 16. 14, 15. 1 *Cor.* 2. 10, 11.

Then

Then for the Fathers, tho they do not once name Mutual-conſciouſneſs, yet he thinketh they meant it. He alledges a few Paſſages out of *Gregory Nyſſen* and St. *Auſtin*, who are all the Fathers he quotes, and his Citations are not only not to his purpoſe, but ſome of them clearly overthrow it. I ſhall ſhew him the reſpect, to conſider what he hath ſaid.

1. Whereas he ſaith, that Mutual-conſciouſneſs maketh the three Divine Spirits, to be *as truly and properly numerically one*; and *as much one, as each Spirit and every Man is one with himſelf*. If this were indeed true, it would as much over-do what the Vindicator expects from it, as he thinketh all former Explications are ſhort of their Deſign. For the Unitarians deſire no more, than that it be owned, God is as truly and properly numerically one, *as every Spirit and Man is one with himſelf*; for every Spirit and Man is ſo one with himſelf, as to be *but one Perſon*.

Had the Vindicator no way to defend the Athanaſian Creed, but by running into Hereſy? could he make out the Unity of the Trinity, no other way but (as the Creed ſpeaks) *by confounding the Perſons*, or by making them but one Perſon? I challenge him, or any other for him, to avoid this Conſequence of his Doctrine. He ſaith in above twenty places, this Mutual-conſciouſneſs maketh the three Divine Spirits and Perſons as much one with one another, as any Spirit or Man is one with himſelf; then ſay I, they are but one Perſon; for that is the Oneneſs or Unity (the only Unity) of every Spirit or Man with himſelf. No Spirit or Man has any other but a Perſonal Unity with himſelf.

2. Mutual-conſciouſneſs cannot be a good Explication of the (pretended) Trinity, becauſe it will equally ſalve the moſt abſurd Doctrine of the Tranſubſtantiation. For as, according to the Vindicator's Doctrine, *the Godhead*, or the One true God, is numerically One, tho there are three Infinite Perſons, each of which is God, and a God; becauſe theſe three Perſons are mutually conſcious to, or have an inward Senſation of one another: So will a Papiſt ſay, there is but one *Body-head*, or but one Numerical Body of Chriſt; but in the Unity of this *Body-head* or Body, there is firſt the Original Body of Chriſt, and then abundance of Sacred *Hoſts* in divers places, each of which is a true Body of Chriſt, and is by Mutual Senſation and Conſciouſneſs (for there is no Senſation without Conſciouſneſs) numerically one Body with the Original Body in Heaven. 'Tis true, the Body in Heaven is the Source and Fountain of the reſt, as the Father is of the other Divine Perſons, but they are all *ſubſtantially and numerically* one Body, by Mutual-conſciouſneſs or Senſation. And this mutual inward Senſation or Conſciouſneſs they muſt needs have, becauſe they are all of them *Perſonally united* to one Infinite Spirit or Perſon, who (as all Trinitarians ſay) is *Whole and All* everywhere preſent, *Totus in toto, & totus in qualibet parte*. By this Explication or *Hypotheſis*, all Mr. *Johnſon*'s Demonſtrations againſt the Tranſubſtantiation, are made to vaniſh into Smoke. All his Objections from the nature of *Time* and *Extenſion* are nothing; they are all ſalved by Mutual-conſciouſneſs of *the Hoſts* with the Body in Heaven; for Dr. *Sherlock* has aſſured us, that Mutual-conſciouſneſs or Senſation, doth make *an Eſſential, Subſtantial and Numerical Unity* or Oneneſs between any number of Perſons or Things. The Reaſon holds for *Things* as well as *Perſons*, and for a thouſand as well as for three.

3. If, as the Vindicator often ſays, Mutual-conſciouſneſs is *the only Union of Spirits or Minds*, ſuch a Mutual-conſciouſneſs by which they are univerſally, or wholly, or perfectly conſcious to each other; this would as much prejudice the Incarnation, or Hypoſtatical Union, as the Vindicator hopes it will help the Doctrine of the Trinity. The Vindicator confeſſes at *p.* 269, and 270, that the Human Nature, or Reaſonable Soul of Chriſt, is not univerſally, or wholly conſcious to the Divine Perſon of the Son; yet he ſays, in perhaps forty places, that a Mutual-conſciouſneſs to all one anothers Thoughts and Wills and Actions, is neceſſary to make an Union of Minds or Spirits. I ſay, it follows from theſe

Premiſes, that the Reaſonable Soul or Spirit of the Lord Chriſt is not united to the Divine Perſon of the Son. If univerſal Conſciouſneſs is *the only poſſible Union* of Spirits, 'tis impoſſible there ſhould be an Incarnation, or an Hypoſtatical or Perſonal Union of the Divine and Human Spirits in Chriſt.

The Vindicator ſeems to have been, in ſome meaſure, aware of this Objecton. For in the Concluſion of his Book, when he comes to the Doctrine of the Incarnation, or Hypoſtatical Union, he ſays, "Where diffe-"rent Natures are united into one Perſon, "this univerſal Conſciouſneſs is ſeated only "in the Superior Nature; and in the Infe-"rior, only ſo far as the Nature is capable, "and as the Perſonal Union requires. But I will forgive the Vindicator, if he can ſo, eſcape from me.

Firſt; If, as he ſays, a partial Conſciouſneſs in the Inferior Nature be ſufficient to effect an Hypoſtatical or Perſonal Union, it will follow, that all pious Men are hypoſtatically or perſonally united to the Holy Ghoſt. For the Holy Spirit is univerſally conſcious to all their Thoughts and Actions, and they are partially conſcious to his Suggeſtions and Motions, and that by ſuch *an Internal Senſation* as they are to their own Thoughts and Inclinations. They cannot diſcern one from the other.

Secondly; If *a Partial Conſciouſneſs* between two or more Spirits, where but one of them is univerſally conſcious to the reſt, will make them numerically one Perſon, or (what is the ſame thing) will effect an Hypoſtatical or Perſonal Union; then certainly where two or more Spirits are *univerſally conſcious* to one another, it muſt much more make them numerically one Perſon, or effect an Hypoſtatical or Perſonal Union. From whence it will follow, that the three Divine Perſons being univerſally conſcious to one another, are numerically one Perſon, and are hypoſtatically and perſonally united. But this every one knows is Hereſy, and contrary to the Athanaſian Creed, which forbids us *to confound the Perſons*.

Thirdly; But the truth is, a Partial Mutual-conſciouſneſs in one of the Spirits (though the other be univerſally conſcious) is not ſufficient to make a Perſonal Union, or to make two or more Perſons to be numerically one Perſon. The Reaſon is this, ſince univerſal Mutual-Conſciouſneſs is therefore ſaid (by the Vindicator) to make more Spirits to be numerically one, becauſe *in every one of them* it amounts to as much as, and is equivalent to the Self-conſciouſneſs or Self-unity of each Spirit with it ſelf; for it makes more Spirits as conſcious to one another (and therefore as numerically one) as every Spirit is to it ſelf: from hence it neceſſarily follows, that a Mutual Conſciouſneſs which is not univerſal in both Spirits, cannot effect a Perſonal Union, or make them numerically one Perſon, becauſe 'tis undeniable that one of theſe Spirits (the inferior Nature or Spirit) has not ſuch a Mutual-conſciouſneſs with the other Spirit, as is equal to its own Self-conſciouſneſs, which makes it Self-unity.

Hitherto I have ſo argued, as to ſuppoſe, with the Vindicator, that ſuch a Mutual-conſciouſneſs as he has deſcribed when 'tis univerſal, may have the effect he ſuppoſeth; that is, may effect a Numerical Oneneſs or Unity, and have only ſhewn, that however it has ſeveral ſuch Heretical Conſequences, that it muſt not be admitted by him or any other. For we have ſeen it maketh the three Divine Perſons to be but one Perſon, becauſe (he ſaith) it makes them as much one, as each Spirit, Perſon, or Man is one with himſelf. Alſo this *Hypotheſis* will do as much Service to the Tranſubſtantiation, as to the Trinity; for it will make as Subſtantial and Numerical an Unity between the *Hoſts* and the Body in Heaven, as between the three Divine Spirits. Farther, it deſtroys the Hypoſtatical Union; for 'tis plain that a Partial Conſciouſneſs between the Human and Divine Spirits in the Lord Chriſt, cannot make a Perſonal Union, or make them numerically one Perſon, becauſe in his Human Spirit 'tis not equal to that Self-conſciouſneſs, which the Vindicator affirms to be the Self-unity of every Intelligent Being. But now I ſhall prove, that,

4. Mutu-

4. Mutual Conſciouſneſs, notwithſtanding the Vindicator's confident Affirmation, and frequent Repetition of it, doth not indeed make the three Divine Perſons to be numerically one, or ſo one, as each Spirit and every Man is one with himſelf; nay, it neither is nor effecteth any real Unity at all. For though he is careful to ſuppoſe, that the three Perſons are mutually conſcious *by an internal Senſation*, and that they are conſcious *to all* the Thoughts, Wills and Actions of one another, as each Perſon of them, and as every Man is internally conſcious to all his own Thoughts and Actions, all which he thinketh muſt make them numerically one Spirit and one God; becauſe (in his Opinion) it amounts to as much as, and is equivalent to, that Self-conſciouſneſs which is (he ſaith) the Self-unity of each Spirit, and every Man with himſelf. Tho (I ſay) he is careful to ſuppoſe thus much, yet I ſhall mind him of a thing which will ruin his whole *Hypotheſis*; even this, that the three Divine Spirits or Perſons, tho they are univerſally and internally conſcious to one another, yet becauſe they are not *in the ſame manner* conſcious to one anothers Thoughts and Actions, as each Spirit of them and each Man is conſcious to his own Thoughts and Actions; therefore the Mutual-conſciouſneſs which he ſuppoſes they have, cannot make them numerically one Spirit, or one God. None of them is conſcious to the Thoughts and Actions of the other two *as his own*, but as riſing *in* and *from* the other Perſons; but each of theſe Spirits, and every Man is conſcious to his own Thoughts and Actions, as riſing *in* and *from* himſelf, from his own Perſonal Underſtanding, Will, and Power of Action.

Let me hear the Vindicator ſay, that the Son (for Example) knows and feels the Thoughts and Actions of the Father and Spirit, not as the Thoughts and Actions of the Father and Spirit, but *as his own Perſonal Thoughts and Actions*, or as originated in his own Perſon; and I will allow that ſuch Conſciouſneſs doth look ſomewhat like a numerical Oneneſs or Unity. But I will demonſtrate to him, that ſo to ſay, is both Hereſy, and a Contradiction.

It is Heretical, becauſe then the Father's Perſonal Action of *Generation* would be known and felt by the Son, *as the Action of the Son*; that is, the Son would know and feel that he begets himſelf. Alſo *the mutual Love* of the Father, and of the Image, or Son, whereby (as this Athanaſian Doctor feigns) the Holy Spirit proceeds from them, would be known and felt by the Holy Spirit, as his own Perſonal Action, nor as the Action of the Father and Son. Both which are Heretical when affirmed by any.

But beſides, that it is Hereſy, 'tis alſo a Contradiction: 'Tis juſt as much a Contradiction, as to ſay, that the Perſon and Perſonal Underſtanding of the Son, is the Perſon and Perſonal Underſtanding of the Father. If we confound the Perſons and Perſonal Thoughts and Actions of the Father, Son and Spirit, we confound alſo their Perſonal Underſtandings, Wills, and Powers of Action. If each Perſon of them has his Perſonal Underſtanding, Will, and Power of Action, he has alſo his Perſonal Thoughts and Actions; and conſequently, the Son cannot feel the Thoughts and Actions of the Father, *as his own* Perſonal Thoughts and Actions, but as the Thoughts and Actions of the Father. But if ſo, all Men muſt grant, that ſuch Mutual-conſciouſneſs of the three Divine Perſons, neither is, or effecteth a Numerical Unity, or any Unity at all. It cannot, I ſay, make them one Spirit, or One God, but leaves them as much three as other *ſeparate* Spirits or Beings are. For 'tis ſuch a Conſciouſneſs as may be, and actually is, between the moſt oppoſite contrary and ſeparate Natures and Spirits. For all Men are after this manner conſcious both to the Holy Spirit, and to the Tempter. We are conſcious to the Suggeſtions and Motions of the firſt, and to the Temptations of the other, *by an internal Conſciouſneſs*; nay by ſuch a perfect intimate Conſciouſneſs, that we do not always diſcern them from our own Perſonal Thoughts, or the Motions and Actings of our own Spirits; which is ſome-

what a *cloſer Conſciouſneſs* than the Vindicator has ſuppoſed, or dares ſuppoſe between the three Divine Perſons; and yet it leaves us ſeparate Beings and Spirits, both from the Holy Spirit, and from the Tempter.

5. If there were indeed ſuch a thing as the Vindicator's mutual Conſciouſneſs, I do affirm, it would be ſo far from being, or from effecting a numerical Unity or Oneneſs, that it would be the very thing which would moſt of all prove the three (pretended) Divine Perſons are numerically three Spirits and three Gods. For ſince, according to the Vindicator's Deſcriptions, each of theſe Spirits or Perſons has his own Perſonal Underſtanding, Will and Power of Action, and his own Perſonal abſolutely perfect Wiſdom, Power and Goodneſs; three ſuch Perſons are ſo far from being one Spirit or one God, by Conſciouſneſs to each others Wiſdom, Power and Goodneſs, that the more ſuch Perſons are mutually conſcious, ſo much the more their *ſeparate* Exiſtence and Divinity is proved. For the more that any of theſe Spirits knows and feels of Thoughts and Actions ariſing in the other Spirits or Perſons, and to which he is only conſcious, but is not the Perſonal Fountain of them; the more, and more certainly, he muſt needs know and feel, that himſelf has a divers and ſeparate Exiſtence from them, and therefore (being an Infinite Perſon or Spirit) is a divers and ſeparate God.

I challenge the Vindicator to tell me any other poſſible way for three Divine Perſons to be aſſured of their ſeparate Exiſtence and Divinity; that is, that they are three God's, but by Mutual-conſciouſneſs, or by knowing and feeling (as he ſpeaks) the Thoughts and Actions of one another, *not as their own*, but as the Thoughts and Actions of other Divine Spirits. How ſhould the Father, for example, know He is a ſeparate Spirit and God from the Son, but by knowing and feeling the Actions of the Son, not as his (the Fathers) Actions, but as the Actions and Thoughts of another Divine and Infinite Perſon? It was therefore a great Incogitance in the Vindicator, to urge the (pretended) Mutual-conſciouſneſs of the three (pretended) Divine Perſons, as their numerical Unity or Oneneſs, when it demonſtrates them to be numerically three ſeparate and divers Beings, Spirits and Gods.

Had the Vindicator ſaid, there are three Infinite Spirits, who are mutually conſcious, THEREFORE there are three Gods; all Mankind would have allowed his Conſequence, as certain and ſelf-evident from that Propoſition. But to ſay there are three Infinite Spirits, conſcious to one another, THEREFORE there is but one God; this all Men of Senſe will laugh at, as *a palpable* Falſhood. 'Tis a Contradiction in the Terms, to tell us of *One only God mutually conſcious*; for in plainer Engliſh 'tis to ſay, *One only God conſcious to, or with other Gods.* Or, *One only God conſcious to more Gods.*

6. But the great Matter is ſtill behind, that after all, our Bleſſed Saviour himſelf has declared, that there is not this Mutual-conſciouſneſs between the (ſuppoſed) Divine Perſons, which the Vindicator has made to be the Subſtance of his Anſwer to the Brief Notes, and the Brief Hiſtory. *Of that day and hour* (the day and hour of the laſt Judgment) *none knoweth, no not the Angels which are in Heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only*; *Mark* 13. 32. *Mat.* 24. 36. Here it is expreſly denied, that the Son knows the time of the laſt Judgment, and as clearly intimated that the Father, and *the Father only* (therefore not the Holy Ghoſt, if we take the Holy Ghoſt for a particular Perſon) knows that time. Therefore, ſay I, the Son and Holy Ghoſt are not conſcious to all the Knowledg, Will and Thoughts of the Father, and conſequently are not Gods, or God.

To avoid this Argument, the Vindicator and his Party anſwer, that Chriſt in that Text ſpeaks of himſelf, only as he is a Man, not as he is God, or *a* God. Well, but how ſhall we ſalve the Honour of the Holy Ghoſt, for 'tis there alſo ſaid, that *the Father only* knoweth that day and hour? Why, for that, the word *Father* here does not ſignify *the Father only*, but includes the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. But when mention is made of the *Father* and the *Son* in the ſame Period, and they are oppoſed to each other, 'tis much

much that neither the Son ſhould ſignify the Son, (for the Human Nature, or Chriſt *as Man*, according to the Trinitarians, is not the Son) nor the Father ſignify the Father, but the Father and two other Perſons. If this be not to form the Scriptures to our preconceived Opinions, and not our Opinions by the Scriptures; let the Vindicator himſelf tell me what is? Should a Socinian diſtort the known ſenſe and uſe of Words at this rate, what Out-cries ſhould we have againſt them!

Nor was it our Saviour's manner to anſwer after this equivocal deluſory faſhion: But when the Diſciples were more inquiſitive than he liked of, he was not wont to ſhift off the matter by an Equivocation, but plainly to tell them, They asked after what 'twas not permitted to them to know. *Wilt thou at this time reſtore the Kingdom to Iſrael?* ſay the Diſciples at *Acts* 1.6,7. *'Tis not for you to know*, ſaith our Saviour. How unlike is this direct ſincere Anſwer to that which the Trinitarians have made for him about the Day of Judgment? For their Anſwer runs thus; "As to the day and hour of Judgment, of "which you enquire, none knoweth it, not "the Angels, not the Son himſelf, but my Fa"ther only. But when I ſay the Son, that "is, *I my ſelf* know it not, I mean (*ſaith he "to himſelf*) according to my Human Nature, "which indeed is not the Son; and when I "ſay, only my Father knoweth it, I mean "(*ſaith he again to himſelf*) only my Father "*and my ſelf*, and the Holy Ghoſt. This is ſuch *an over-grown Equivocation*, and Mental Reſervation, as in our Town would paſs for a groſs Lie; but that the Vindicator and his Party have aſſured us, that our Saviour himſelf ſpake thus. But I do not think any ſenſible and honeſt Man will believe 'em, if he conſiders it twice.

'Tis thus alſo that they have dealt with God himſelf, ſpeaking in the firſt Commandment; *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods but Me*, ſaith God in the words of the firſt Commandment. And to render this his Soveraign Revelation and Will the more awful and regarded by us, he delivered it in Thunders that ſhook the Heavens and the Earth. Notwithſtanding this, and tho every one knows that the Stile of Laws is plain and ſimple, and the words to be underſtood in a popular familiar Senſe, becauſe they are delivered to the meaneſt as well as the higheſt Capacities; yet have thoſe who call themſelves the Orthodox and the Catholick Party eluded this Revelation and Law, to which all the reſt refer, and on which they depend, and have made room for *other Gods beſides him*. *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods beſides Me*; that is, (ſay they) Thou ſhalt have no other Gods but *Us*, no other Gods, but God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghoſt: Thou ſhalt have no other Gods, but three Infinite Almighty, All-knowing Perſons; whereof one is the Father, another his Son, and the third an holy Spirit diſtinct from both.

I perſwade my ſelf that no Man can think that ſo much as one Perſon of the ſix hundred thouſand *Iſraelites* who aſſembled to hear God ſpeak, did (or poſſibly could) underſtand that to be his meaning; but on the contrary, when they heard, *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods but Me*, they did, and their Poſterity to this day do, underſtand it no otherways but thus, *Thou ſhalt never know or own more than one Divine Perſon, even Me who now ſpeak to thee.* When Points of Faith are turned into Laws, we ought to be careful how we elude their plain and obvious ſenſe *by Subtilties*; for ſuch things will not excuſe the Breach of Laws, eſpecially of the firſt and chief Law, the ground of the reſt, to which they all refer as their chief Deſign. Rather we ſhould interpret all other dubious and diſputable Scripture-Expreſſions by ſuch ſolemn Principal and Chief Revelations and Laws. The Vindicator, 'tis ſaid, is writing a Book to prove, that there are more Perſons (the Son and Spirit) beſides the Eternal *God and Father of our Lord Chriſt*, who are Gods, or God, that is, he is writing a Book againſt the firſt Commandment. And I confeſs, that as his Party have ordered the vulgar Editions and Tranſlations of the Holy Bible, it will be no hard matter to alledg ſome very plauſible Texts to ſuch as know not the Deceits that have

been

been uſed, to make ſome Texts of Scripture contradict others. But I challenge him before-hand, to produce but one ſuch Proof or Text for his purpoſe, as is not of ſuch *ſuſpected Credit* and Authority in the Originals, that no prudent Man would build any thing on it, much leſs oppoſe it to the firſt Commandment, or is ſo *manifeſtly faulty in the Engliſh Tranſlation*, that ſome of the moſt Learned of his own Party do reject it as no Proof; or finally, is not only *not to his purpoſe*, but proves what the Unitarians contend for, the Unity of God, or that *God is One*. But this was a Digreſſion; I left off at our Saviour's words, *Of that day and hour* (the day and hour of the laſt Judgment) *none knoweth but my Father only*, which I hope were ſufficiently vindicated from the Perverſions of Dr. *Sherlock*, and others.

But let our Saviour ſay what he will, and as expreſly as he will, the Doctor will prove againſt him, that there is this perfect Mutual-conſciouſneſs between Him, the Holy Spirit, and the Father.

His firſt Objection is from *Joh.* 1. 18. *The only Begotten Son, which is in the Boſom of the Father, hath declared him.* To be *in the Boſom of another*, ſignifies, ſays the Vindicator, to be conſcious to that Perſon's Mind, and moſt intimate Secrets; therefore the Son is conſcious to the Father. *Anſw.* But why did not the Vindicator produce ſome Texts to confirm this Interpretation? The truth is, the Scripture-Senſe of this Phraſe, *To be in the Boſom of another*, is this, *to be moſt dear* to that Perſon, as is clear from *Deut.* 28. 54, 56. 2 *Sam.* 12. 3. So the Senſe of the objected Text is only this, The only Begotten Son, who is moſt dear to the Father, hath declared him, *i. e.* hath made known his Will and Commands in the Goſpel.

He objects, *Joh.* 10. 15. *As the Father knoweth me, ſo know I the Father.* *Anſw.* If the Vindicator had look'd into the Critical Commentators of his own Party, he would have ſeen, that *to know* in this Text is *to love*. But allowing him his Senſe of the words; I anſwer, as much is propheſied of all Chriſtians in Goſpel-times, *Jer.* 31. 34. *They ſhall all know me, from the greateſt to the leaſt of them.* Nor does [*as*] here note Equality of Knowledge in the Son, but Likeneſs only; as at *Mat.* 5. 48. *Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect.* Therefore the Senſe is, the Father knoweth me, and I alſo know the Father (not by Natural or Congenit Conſciouſneſs, but) by his Revelation. See *Rev.* 1. 1.

Joh. 10. 30. *I and the Father are One.* This Oneneſs or In-being, ſaith the Vindicator, is a Mutual-conſciouſneſs and inward Senſation of each other. *Anſw.* But our Saviour explains this Oneneſs, to be ſuch an Unity or Oneneſs as is (or ſhould be) among all Chriſtians; which is not by Mutual-conſciouſneſs or inward Senſation, but Mutual and Inward Love of one another. *John* 17. 11. *Father, —keep thoſe whom thou haſt given me, that they may be One as we are.* Ver. 22. *That they may be One, even as we are One.*

Again, he urgeth *Joh.* 10. 38. *The Father is in me, and I in him.* The Vindicator inſiſteth much on this, as a clear Indication of an inward Conſciouſneſs between the Father and Son. *Anſw.* But here again our Saviour has otherways explain'd himſelf, namely thus, that he means ſuch an In-being as is between all Chriſtians and the Father; an In-being by Love, and the Gift of the Spirit, on the part of the Father, and on our part, by Love, and Obedience, and Profeſſion of the Truth: *Joh.* 17. 21. *That they all may be One, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they may be One in us.* 1 Joh. 3. 24. *He that keepeth his* (God's) *Commandments, dwelleth in Him, and he in him.* 1 Joh. 3. 13. *Hereby we know we dwell in him, and he in us, becauſe he hath given us of his Spirit.* Ver. 15. *Whoſoever ſhall confeſs, that Jeſus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God.* Ver. 16. *He that dwelleth in Love, dwelleth in God, and God in him.*

Joh. 16. 15. *All things that the Father hath are mine.* *Anſw.* See what hath been ſatisfactorily ſaid to this, in the Brief Hiſtory, *pag.* 103.

1 Cor. 2. 10, 11. *The Spirit ſearcheth all things, yea the deep things of God. For what*

Man

Man knoweth the things of a Man, but the Spirit of a Man, which is in him? even ſo the things of God knoweth no Man, but the Spirit of God. Anſw. The Emphaſis lies here; that the Spirit knows the things of God, *even as* the Spirit of a Man knows the things of a Man. Now admitting that the Holy Ghoſt or Spirit were a Perſon, as many Unitarians (particularly the *Bidellians* and *Arians*) believe he is, chief of the holy Spirits or Angels, and called *the Spirit* by way of Excellence, and *the Holy Spirit*, to diſcriminate him from Satan, who is chief of the Wicked and Apoſtate Spirits or Angels. Admitting, I ſay, that the Holy Spirit is a Perſon, yet what hinders that he may *know the things of God*, that is (as appears by Ver. 9.) *the things that God has prepared for them that love him*, as fully and perfectly as the Spirit of a Man knoweth the Deſigns and Counſels of a Man towards other Men? Cannot God as fully reveal thoſe *things of God* to this holy and ſuper-eminent Spirit, as any Man knows his own Will and Deſigns of Good towards others? and is it not thus, that our Saviour alſo is ſaid to know the things of God? *Rev.* 1. 1.

If it be demanded, If this be all, Why is the Spirit called *the Spirit of God?* I hope the Vindicator knows, that 'tis the manner of the Hebrew Tongue to name things great in their kind, by the name of God. He may alſo be called *the Spirit of God*, as Prophets are in Scripture called *the Men of God*, becauſe both one and the other *are ſent by God*. And this Spirit is ſo much the Chief of all other Spirits, that are God's Meſſengers; that he is therefore ſometimes called by way of Eminence and Excellence, *the* Spirit of God. So an *Arian* or *Bidellian* Unitarian would anſwer to the Objection from this Text. How a *Socinian* Unitarian would anſwer, may be ſeen in the Brief Hiſtory, from *p.* 98, to *p.* 102.

The CONCLUSION.

THus I have conſider'd Dr. *Sherlock*'s new Explication of the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation by Self-conſciouſneſs and Mutual conſciouſneſs, and therein the ſubſtance and force of his Book, which he has ſo vainly and untruly called *a Vindication* of thoſe Doctrines. His Book can deſerve that Title in no other ſenſe, but as 'tis a ſupercilious, diſdainful, and peeviſh Anſwer. But for that, the Unitarians know very well, that when Learned Men rage in ſuch a manner, that they have neither Humanity nor good Manners left, *'tis becauſe they find themſelves pinch'd:* they know too, that *Omnis Renegada eſt Ordinis ſui Perſecutor.* Thoſe who have hitherto ſaid (who are all that have read his Books) there is nothing conſiderable in Dr. *Sherlock*'s Books, but what he either borrowed from the *Socinians*, or build upon their Foundation; ſuch will wonder he would ſhew no better Reaſons why he hath ſhifted ſides. He promiſed at *P.* 21. *to examine the Brief Notes Paragraph by Paragraph, that the Author might not complain of unfair Uſage:* But at *p.* 256, before he was got half through the Notes, he pretends to grow *weary of the Note-maker's long Harangues* (tho the whole Notes are leſs than a Sheet of Paper) and ſo gives his Reader only ſo much of the Brief Notes as he fancied he could deal with. Therefore the Author of the Notes will ſay, this was not only unfair, but (after a Promiſe) *falſe Uſage:* Others ſay, the Doctor grew ſelf-conſcious, ſenſible of his Inability, and therefore durſt not truſt his Reader with thoſe dangerous Notes, and his crude Anſwer to them. But where he pretended to anſwer, he ſhould not have ſuppreſſed ſo many Periods, nor omitted to take notice of *the Reaſon* uſed, ſuppoſing it was enough if he oppoſed *the Doctrine.* Leaſt of all ſhould an Anſwerer of his ſtanding and Reputation in Polemic Squabble, have quietly paſt by ſome whole Paragraphs, the moſt material in the Notes; or only caſt a bald ſqueez'd Jeſt at 'em.

As to the ſlight *Quirks* which he ſometimes oppoſes to the *Arguments* in the Notes and Hiſtory, there is an Anſwer preparing, and almoſt finiſh'd, to every thing in his Book, to be publiſh'd, unleſs in his next he is content to own *he deſires it not.* For as to the Unitarians themſelves, they are upon ſeveral accounts not forward

ward to publiſh a farther Anſwer. Firſt, they foreſee, that the Vindication is not a Book, by which the Church of *England*, or any other Party of the Trinitarians, will abide; they look for another kind of Anſwer, and therefore reſerve their Defences to a time and occaſion that may more require them. Another Reaſon is, they dare truſt the Hiſtory and Notes with the Doctor's Anſwer, though he durſt not truſt his Anſwer with the Notes; only they deſire the Reader to read the Notes and Hiſtory as they are publiſh'd by them, in entire Diſcourſes, not as they are mangled, and cut into Thongs by the Vindicator. They are confident that no diſcerning Man who ſhall read Dr. *Sherlock*'s Vindication, and afterwards read again the Notes or Hiſtory, as they are publiſh'd by the Unitarians, but will find himſelf as much troubled to untie *the Gordian Knots*, as if they had never read *the Solutions* of the Vindicator. But I will conclude with him, with only obſerving ſomething to what he has, with his uſual Charity and Sagacity, objected to the Hopes of Salvation in the Unitarian way.

The Note-maker had ſaid, that, 'In theſe 'Points which have been always controverted 'in the Church of God, 'tis not neceſſary to 'Salvation, that a Man happen to be of the 'right Perſwaſion; 'tis ſufficient if he uſe *reaſonable Diligence* to be informed; if after that 'he miſtakes, he is in *no fault at all*, his Error is '*pure Ignorance*, not a culpable Ignorance; for 'how can it be culpable not to know that, of 'which a Man is ignorant *after a diligent and 'impartial Inquiry?* To this the Vindicator anſwers in ſeveral Pages, but all *the Argument* of his Anſwer is in theſe words, 'Then how 'comes an Atheiſt, a Turk, or a Jew to be in 'any fault? Does the Note-maker think that 'no Atheiſt, Turk, or Jew ever uſed *reaſonable Diligence?* And why ſhould not their 'reaſonable Deligence ſerve their turns, as 'well as the reaſonable Diligence of *Socinians*, and other Hereticks? —And does not 'the Reaſon he gives, extend *to the whole 'Chriſtian Religion*, as well as to thoſe Points 'that (he ſays) have been always controverted in the Churches of God?

To this Complement of the Vindicator, I anſwer. 1. I do not think Atheiſm ever was *the abiding* Sentiment of any Man, who took time to conſider; and I deny that any Atheiſt ever uſed *reaſonable*, or but tolerable *Diligence to be informed*. 2. As to Jews and Turks, who believe and worſhip the one true God, and him only; perhaps they are in a nearer Proximity to Salvation than ſuch, as againſt ſufficient Opportunities of a right Information, and for Worldly Intereſts have apoſtatized from the Chriſtian Faith, to the Athanaſian. 3. Thoſe that deny *the whole Chriſtian Religion*, after having known it and the Reaſons of it, the Notemaker is aſſured whatever *Diligence* they may have uſed, they have not made (as the Notes expreſly require) an *Impartial Inquiry*. They have been *byaſſed* by their Prejudices, or their Luſts, *againſt the whole Chriſtian Faith*; as others (we ſee) are byaſſed againſt *the moſt Eſſential* Parts of it, the Unity of God, *his Infinite* Sapience, Goodneſs, Juſtice, and Power, *his real* Omnipreſence, the Liberty of our Wills to Good and Evil. If the Vindicator thinks otherways, let him ſpeak out, and plainly tell the World his Mind; that a Man may have uſed *reaſonable Diligence*, and alſo made *an Impartial Inquiry*, and yet disbelieve *the whole Chriſtian Religion*. This, I hope, may be enough to Dr. *Sherlock* at preſent.

As for Mr. *Savage*, who hath alſo written againſt the Brief Notes, if he had pleaſed to write after an intelligible manner, he ſeems to be a Perſon that might have deſerved a careful Anſwer: But having wrapt himſelf up in a School-Cloud, and wrote in ſuch towring Metaphiſicks, as are much above ordinary or unlearned Capacities; I am ſenſible that, with reſpect to the Unitarian Cauſe, his Book can do neither good nor hurt. However, the Unitarians thank him for his deſign to inform and inſtruct them; and they deſire him not to take it amiſs, if they alſo adviſe him, that the next time he writes for the Information of the *Illiterate* and *Vulgar*, he would write more intelligibly. For,

Learning's Light, when held too high, goes out.

THE END.

SOME

THOUGHTS

UPON

Dr. *Sherlock's* VINDICATION

OF THE

DOCTRINE

OF THE

Holy Trinity.

In a LETTER.

The Second Edition, with Inlargements.

LONDON:

Printed in the Year, M.DC.XCI.

SOME THOUGHTS UPON Dr. *Sherlock*'s VINDICATION, &c.

In a LETTER.

SIR,

SEeing you are pleaſed, That I ſhould give you my Thoughts, about the Book lately ſet out by Dr. *Sherlock*; I am willing to comply with you therein, and to preſent you my Mind, with my ordinary Sincerity.

I obſerve, Firſt, That it is no hard matter for a witty Man, to frame a fine cloſe Syſtem, altogether free from Contradiction or falſe Reaſoning. Metaphyſicks do plentifully afford all ſorts of Contrivances; and let a Man have never ſo little ſoundneſs of Mind, yet it's an eaſy thing for him to write in ſuch a probable way, as is fit to dazle the Reader. *Plato*'s Philoſophy being fruitful of Ideas and Abſtractions, has been the firſt Womb, out of which ſuch Methods have iſſued. The Sophiſms of *Ariſtotle* did prevail afterwards; and at laſt our Modern Divines have been of opinion, that *Carteſius*'s Subtilties afforded the fitteſt means of freeing themſelves from all the Incumbrances of their Myſtery. So true it is, that the Senſe Men have of Religion, depends in a great meaſure upon the Genius of the Philoſophical Sect which they have embraced. Our Author has taken this laſt courſe, and I confeſs, his Scheme appear'd to me prettily contriv'd: But then it's not enough to frame a Cloſe, but a well-grounded Syſtem. Divines are bound to lay a Foundation in Revelation; there it was therefore that I expected the Doctor, and there it is that I have fully diſcovered his Weakneſs.

The two Places of Scripture, which he brings in (*pag.* 51.) to prove the eſſential Unity of Father and Son, are theſe, *I and the Father are One: and the Father is in Me, and I am in him*, John 10. 30, 38. He aſſures us, that Chriſt ſpoke them in a ſenſe of *Unity of Eſſence, and Nature*; and he pretends that the Jews took them in that very Senſe, as he expreſſeth it (pag. 165.) *The Jews underſtood him to mean, that he was the Son of God by*

Nature, and charged him with Blaſphemy for making himſelf God. And pag. 240. *Chriſt declared, I and my Father are One, which the Jews underſtood, (and they did not miſtake him in it) was to make himſelf God.* But how comes it that the Doctor has not perceived, that between thoſe two Paſſages which he cites, which are not at a great diſtance from one another, there is a Third which invalidates all his Proofs, and overthrows the curious Philoſophical Structure, which he pretends to build up? I mean the 35*th* and 36*th* Verſes of the ſame Chapter, ſet down preciſely between thoſe two Citations, where Chriſt moſt exactly explains to the Jews, in what ſenſe he had aſſerted, that he was one with his Father, or which is all one, after what manner he was God. *If he called them Gods, unto whom the Word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken: Say ye of him, whom the Father has ſanctified, and ſent into the World, Thou blaſphemeſt, becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God?* He does not ſay, I, whom the Father has begotten from all Eternity, of his own Subſtance, as he ſhould have ſaid, according to the Author's Mind: But I, whom the Father has ſanctified. Which plainly ſhews, that when he ſaid he was the Son of God, his meaning was, that he was ſo only in a ſenſe of Conſecration and of Miſſion, and conſequently that his Unity with the Father, is not an Eſſential and Natural Unity, as the Author pretends, but a meer Moral and Relative Unity, which conſiſts in the Equality of Works, not of Eſſence, which is abſolutely incommunicable. God imparts his Holineſs to the Faithful, whom he makes thereby *Partakers of his Divine Nature.* He hath imparted to Prophets and Kings his Authority, Knowledge and Power, as Chriſt ſays here: Why can't he then impart to his *Meſſias*, the *King of Kings*, and *the Prince of Prophets*, all his Vertues and all his Glory, in a more intimate Manner, and in a more eminent Degree, *without Meaſure* (as the Scripture hath it, *John* 3. 34.) and as much as a Man is capable of receiving from the Liberality and Almightineſs of him, by whom he is ſanctified and exalted? Different Degrees make nō Alteration in the Nature and Poſſibility of a Thing: and that Supream Degree of Power and Glory, which was imparted to Chriſt, and is called in Scripture *the Fulneſs of the Godhead*, is the true Reaſon of his being ſtiled God.

Thus the Divinity of Chriſt is the ſame, not in Degree, but in Kind, with the Divinity of other Gods, whom God has ſanctified, that is to ſay, an imparted or communicated Divinity; ſeeing They and Chriſt are ſuch, becauſe the Supream God hath ſanctified and ſent them into the World, that is, furniſh'd them with Ability and Authority to act in his Name publickly among Men. Chriſt therefore explained himſelf moſt clearly, ſhewing to the Jews the Ground and Foundation of his Divinity. In effect, the only thing he was to prove againſt them, was, That he had not made himſelf equal to God in a blaſphemous Senſe, by uſurping any thing from God, belonging to his Eſſence or Attributes; but acknowledg'd, that he had his Divinity only from the Liberality, and Unction of him who is the Source of it; ſo that he was not the Son of God by a Communication of Eſſence, but of Gifts. The Compariſon, which he makes of himſelf with other Meſſengers of God, does not hinder him from being ſuch in a more Excellent Degree than the other, whom the Scripture dignifies with that Title. On the contrary, it does ſuppoſe it, as if he had ſaid, *How much more am I ſuch? I, I ſay, who am the greateſt and the nobleſt of the Lord's Anointed ones, if it be true that I am the Meſſias, as I do prove my ſelf to be by the Works, which I do in the Name of my Father which ſent me.* But at the ſame time, this Compariſon plainly ſhews, that he calls himſelf God, or the Son of God, upon the ſame Grounds that the others are ſtiled Gods by the Scripture, *viz.* becauſe the Father hath ſanctified him.

I come now more particularly to the matter in hand. The Author ſays, that thoſe Words, *I and the Father are One*, are to be underſtood *of an Unity of Eſſence and Nature*; that Chriſt ſpoke them in that ſenſe, and

and that the Jews put such an Interpretation upon them: yet all the Divines that are on his side, when they are to explain this place, *Say ye that I Blaspheme*, &c. say, that the Jews stood in no need of being taught all that Christ was, but that it was sufficient for them to know, that he was the Son of God, in a manner Authorized by their Law, and suitable to their Capacities: So it is understood by the Learned Bishop of *Chichester*: (The Witnesses.) *Christ*, says he, *justifies himself by a Reason, which signifies no more, but that he called himself the Christ, the Anointed of God. — And there was no need he should say any thing of the Divine Nature that was in him.* Therefore I argue thus; If there was no need for the Jews to know, that Christ was the Son of God by Nature, why did he immediately before declare, that he and the Father are One by an Unity of Nature? Why did he teach that Fundamental Truth, that he is of the same Essence with the Father, Supream God as the Father? Was it not that they might understand what he taught them? And when they had understood him, why does he draw them off from their Understanding, by bringing in a Sense of Unction and Sanctification, instead of a Sense of Nature, that is to say, a Socinian Sense instead of an Orthodox? If they took his Word in a Sense of *Nature*, does he not undeceive them by substituting another, which is as remote from it, as Earth is from Heaven? Or rather does he not deceive them by leaping from one thing to another, by running into equivocal Terms to avoid their Fury, by telling them that this Term of *Son of God*, which he had at first insinuated in a Sense of Nature, may admit of another Sense, less capable of exasperating them, viz. A figurative Sense, a Sense of Consecration? Because Christ's Hour was not yet come, as *Trinitarians* speak, or that it was not time to reveal that great Mystery, was it better to overthrow a good Sense, and the right Impression caused by the first Words, than to be stoned? As if Christ had no other means of escaping from the Jews, than to prevaricate by disowning a Capital Truth, which he had advanced, and had been rightly understood. He who came to lay down his Life to bear witness to the Truth, shall he act against his Father's Intent, and the Duties of his Designation, by preserving his Life at the cost of Truth?

I know that our Blessed Saviour delivers his Doctrine in profound Wisdom, having regard to the Circumstances of Place, Time and Persons. However there is a vast difference between the delivering of a Doctrine in a prudent and wise Manner, and the disowning of a Truth, when it has been once delivered; or (which comes to the same) the taking away of a true and genuine Impression, made by some words suitable to the Intent of him that speaks, to put into its room a new Sense, which neither the Hearer nor the Teacher had at first thought of. In a word, the Doctor cannot alledge this Reason taken from a prudent Dispensation, seeing among his Proofs he brings in the 38 Verse, which follows this: wherein Christ, as he thinks, comes again to the Sense of Nature. But how can this be, if he had before prudently desisted from it, being contented with the Sense of Sanctification, as more suitable to their Needs? The Orthodox (as they call themselves) can no ways escape, if Christ made use of this latter Reason, taken from his Sanctification, to avoid the Fury of the Jews: He hath at the same time given away the former, taken from the Eternal Generation, which had so much exasperated them against him; or else it had been to no purpose, if teaching the latter, which did appease them, he had been willing they should have believed the former, which did exasperate them. No, no, but it is as if he had said, *Why do ye stone me?* I did not mean that I was the Son of God by Nature, as you do fancy, but only by Sanctification and by Unction, which is no way contrary to your Law, nor Blasphemy, as the former would be. Is it not as if he had said, that he was the *Son of God* only in such a sense as is not Blasphemy according to their Law? that is, that he is such only in a Sense exclu-

sive

ſive to all other that ſhould make him liable to ſtoning?

I ſhould think this Paſſage written with the very Finger of Truth, to be unanſwerable, were it not that I know the Orthodox are wont to darken the moſt bright Light, at the coſt of Sincerity and good Senſe, and make no Scruple of the groſſeſt Contradictions and Abſurdities, ſo they may but caſt Duſt in the Eyes of ſimple Men.

Now any one may ſee that I might argue againſt the Second Proof made uſe of by the Author, as I have done againſt the Firſt: the Paſſage I am explaining affording me the ſame Reaſons againſt either of them, ſeeing it ſtands between them, and caſts its Light both upon the foregoing and the following Verſes. But the Intelligent Reader may do it himſelf, with the help of theſe Obſervations. *Calvin's* ſolid and penetrating Wit did ſo well perceive the ſtrength of theſe Reflections, that he aſſerts (*See his Comment upon the Place.*) that the Fathers had erroneouſly made uſe of thoſe words againſt the *Arians*, *I and the Father are one*; ſo far was he from ſpying therein any Unity of Eſſence. I have proved that the Doctor does alſo uſe them courſely, and conſequently the other Paſſages, which he alledges for the confirmation of this, *viz.* That *the Word was with God*; *that it was in the Boſom of the Father*, *&c.* ought to be explained with reſpect to this expreſs Declaration of the Saviour of the World himſelf. So that if he ſaid he was the *Son of God*, it is, becauſe the Father had ſanctified and ſent him into the World, as other Perſons are likewiſe called Gods, to whom the Divine Word or Commiſſion has come, but in a far different Proportion. Therefore I would have the Author to know, that ſince this Paſſage contains in a moſt clear and exact way, the true Foundation upon which is grounded the Title of *Son of God*, which Chriſt aſcribes to himſelf; I may lawfully make uſe of it to explain any other Paſſage, wherein Chriſt is ſtiled *God*, or *Son of God*, unleſs he can prove that ſuch a Senſe cannot be applied to them, without a Contradiction, or bring another Reaſon, upon which the Title of *Son of God* is alſo expreſly grounded; as for example, the Eternal Generation. But all the Paſſages of the Goſpel which contain a Reaſon, why Chriſt is called the *Son of God*, and wherein the very term of Generation is made uſe of, are of the ſame Nature with this, containing only Reaſons of the ſame kind; for they are all taken from the Oeconomy and Miniſtry of Chriſt: Some from his Conception by the Holy Ghoſt; the other from his Reſurrection and Exaltation, but none at all from his Eternal Generation.

The Title of *Son of God* is in Scripture grounded upon theſe Five Things: Two that are taken from his Twofold Birth, the One out of the *Womb of the Virgin*, by the operation of the Holy Ghoſt, *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee, and the Power of the Higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee*: Therefore alſo *that Holy Thing which ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called the* Son of God. *Luke* 1. 35. The other out of the *Womb of the Earth*, by virtue of his Reſurrection, *And we declare unto you glad Tidings, how that the Promiſe which was made unto the Fathers, God hath fulfilled the ſame, in that he hath raiſed up Jeſus again*; *as it is alſo written in the ſecond* Pſalm, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* Acts 13. 32, 33. Theſe two Things make him undoubtedly the Natural *Son of God*, his *only begotten Son*, his *proper* or *own Son*: He alone being born of a Virgin by the Holy Ghoſt: He alone being the Firſt-born from the Dead. Thus the Title of Son of God is beſtowed upon him after an incommunicable way. The Three other Grounds of Chriſt's Sonſhip, are drawn from his Offices. The Firſt; Becauſe he is that Prophet, *whom the Father hath ſanctified and ſent into the World*, with an extraordinary Commiſſion, and an Unction without Meaſure; for the Holy Ghoſt deſcended upon him, and there came a Voice from Heaven, ſaying, *This is my beloved Son*, &c. *Mat.* 3. laſt. The Second; Becauſe he is the Great High-Prieſt, immediately called to that Office by God himſelf, who ſaid unto him, *Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee*,

thee, Heb. 5. 5. And the Third, Becauſe he is the King, whom God hath exalted to a Supream Power, both in Heaven and Earth, directing to him the ſame Speech, *Thou art my Son*, &c. Heb. 1. 5. which makes him the Son of God by way of Excellence, or Preeminence above all the other Prophets, Prieſts and Kings. The Scripture does expreſly afford us all theſe Grounds of Chriſt's Divinity, and in the very Places, wherein the Holy Ghoſt intends to explain himſelf, and to let us know, why *God* dignifies *Chriſt* with the Name and Title of his Son. They are not meer Words, but Expoſitions and Comments upon the other places, the ſenſe of which is not ſo clear and obvious. They are ſuch Reaſons as fill up the Idea of the Terms, where Chriſt is called the *only begotten Son of God*, his *beloved Son*, and his *own Son*. If there be any other which aſcribe to him the ſame Honour in a Senſe of an Eternal Generation, and ſay, that he is ſuch, becauſe the Father has begotten him from all Eternity of his own Subſtance, let them produce them, and ſhew; 1. That ſuch a Generation is therein expreſly contained. 2. That it is the Baſis of that glorious Title of *God*, or *Son of God*, beſtowed upon Chriſt. Till therefore the Doctor brings new Reaſon of another kind, taken from the Eternal Generation, upon which, as upon a ſolid Foundation, the Title of Son of God is clearly grounded, and with as much evidence, as it is upon the places above mentioned; till then, I ſay, I may lawfully determine the Senſe of thoſe naked and ſimple Expreſſions controverted amongſt us, by the ſenſe of thoſe Paſſages, wherein our Queſtion is determined. What indeed is this Conception, this Sanctification, this Reſurrection, this heavenly Inſtalment and Exaltation, which made him to be the Son of God? Is all this an Eternal Generation? Shall we underſtand by *to Day*, Eternity, and not this very time, this Day, of his ſecond Birth and of his Coronation?

Let us endeavour to make this Author ſenſible of this Difficulty, which perhaps he has perceived already. The Queſtion now controverted amongſt us, *viz.* in what Senſe Chriſt is God, was formerly agitated in his Preſence. The Jews his Adverſaries aſſerted, as our Orthodox do, that he had made himſelf God by Nature, and the Doctor aſſures us that they miſtook not Chriſt's meaning. However it does plainly appear that Chriſt refutes this Accuſation; that he clears himſelf of the Blaſphemy, wherewith the Jews and the Doctor charge him, and plainly aſſerts that he told them he was the Son of God in a like Senſe only as others ſent by God are, whom the Scripture dignifies with the Title of Gods. Here is the Controverſy determined in behalf of the Doctor's Adverſaries. Here conſequently the Jews are convinced of being Calumniators, and the Doctor of being miſtaken as well as they. Indeed Chriſt ſhuns to ſtile himſelf God, tho it follows from his Reaſoning that he has right to ſuch a Title. He is contented to ſtile himſelf the Son of God. And hereupon, I think, is grounded *Lactantius*'s Obſervation, wherein, ſpeaking of Chriſt, he ſays, (lib. 4. c. 14.) *Nunquam ſeipſe Deum dixit, quia non ſervaſſet fidem, ſi miſſus ut Deos tolleret, & unum aſſereret, induceret alium præter unum.* 'He never ſtiled himſelf God, becauſe 'he ſhould not have perform'd his Truſt, if 'being ſent to take away Gods, and to aſſert 'that there is but one, he ſhould have intro-'duced another beſides one. When the Jews, offended at the Doctrine of Chriſt, objected againſt him, *How can this Man give us his Fleſh to eat?* Suppoſing that Chriſt had returned them this Anſwer, *How? by offering it to your Faith:* then the Diſpute would be decided in the behalf of the Reformed Churches. Thus it ſtands here. The Jews, ſcandalized, break out into this Objection, *How? Thou being a Man, makeſt thy ſelf God?* Chriſt anſwers, *How? Becauſe the Father has ſanctified me, as the other Gods mentioned in your Law.* The Queſtion therefore is decided in the behalf of the *Unitarians*.

But this is not all, the *Unitarians*, or *Sociniens*, do not only rely upon clear Paſſages, wherein their Concluſions are plainly contained,

tained, but upon the Analogy of Faith, I mean the Primitive Facts and Doctrines ſet down in the Creed of the Apoſtles, which ought to fix by their own Evidence the Senſe of thoſe remote Doctrines, where Truth is not ſo obvious, nor ſo often repeated. Thoſe Primitive Facts ſhew forth that unalterable Faith, which is liable neither to Diſpute nor Change, and is ſtiled by *Tertullian*, *Regula Fidei immobilis & inreformabilis*; an unmoveable and unalterable Rule of Faith: and by *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, *Quod ſemper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum eſt*; That which has been believed in all times, every where, and by all Men. Take away thoſe unvariable Objects, there remains nothing but Uncertainty and Confuſion: Moral Things being capable of receiving infinite different Interpretations, and both Human and Divine Speech being ſuſceptible of a thouſand poſſible and probable Senſes, unleſs Reaſon and the Primitive Objects of Revelation reſtrain them to a fixt Senſe, whereby our Idea's may be determined to ſome undeniable matter, that no rational Diſpute can overthrow. Thoſe Primitive Facts are the Birth, the Life, the Death, the Reſurrection and Aſcenſion of Chriſt, whereby we are taught that Chriſt was a Man like unto us in all things, Sin only excepted, which Facts are an unmoveable Foundation, according to which we ought to examin the other parts of the Revelation, not by Metaphyſical Diſtinctions of Eſſence, Perſons and Natures, which the Holy Ghoſt never thought of, but by reaſons of Diſpenſation and Oeconomy, which teach us that he, who was a Man like unto us, has had, through his Obedience, the Supream Dignity of Son of God conferr'd upon him, God having made him Lord and Chriſt; yea, *Deus illum fecit Deum*, ſays St. *Ambroſe de fid. ad Gratian.* not as the Author is pleaſed to ſay, that God has only declared thereby that he was his Son by an Eternal Generation. The Scripture can admit of no ſuch Senſe, when it ſays, (*See the Greek and Engliſh Margin*) that Chriſt *was determined the Son of God in Power, by the Reſurrection from the Dead.* And more expreſly yet, when it does affirm, that upon the account of his Sufferings, *God has highly exalted him, and given him a Name above every Name.* The Senſe, which the Author puts upon it, would deprive Chriſt of all the Glory of his Vertue and his Obedience: whereas the Senſe of the Scripture conſiſts in aſcribing to his Sufferings the Ground and Foundation of his Exaltation.

Now after ſo particulariz'd a Hiſtory of the Birth, Life, Death, Reſurrection and Aſcenſion of the *Meſſias*; after ſo conſtant and well known Facts: Who would think that ſome Expreſſions by the by, ſhould have made us miſtake him, who is the Subject of this Hiſtory, for the Supream God? We have in this imitated the Jews, who finding it a hard task to reconcile the Sufferings of the *Meſſias* with the Glory aſcribed to him by the Prophets, have contrived two *Meſſiaſſes*, one the Son of *David*, a glorious Conqueror; the other the Son of *Joſeph*, afflicted and miſerable. Thus we being not willing to reconcile Chriſt's Humiliation with his glorious Exaltation, had rather fancy two Natures, or rather two Perſons in Chriſt, than to admit of a Senſe delivered by the ſacred Scripture it ſelf, which calls them Gods, whom God exalts to a Supream Dignity; eſpecially when ſuch an Exaltation is immediately conferr'd. We chuſe rather to renounce common Senſe and Reaſon, and to fly to incomprehenſible Mataphyſicks, than to interpret Expreſſions relating to Diſpenſation according to Primitive Truths, and Hiſtorical Terms; which are the Main of the Goſpel, and ought to fix the Senſe of all the reſt.

Shall my Faith depend upon *Plato*'s Ideas, *Ariſtotle*'s Subtilties, *Carteſius* his ſelf and mutual Conſciouſneſs, and Metaphyſical Abſtractions, more unintelligible to poor Mortal Men than the Tongue of Angels? Alas! If the School-Men who teach me to ſay in my familiar Catechiſm, that there are Three Perſons in one Numerical Eſſence, had been pleaſed to teach me on the contrary, that there are Three Eſſences in one Numerical Perſon, I could have liked this latter as well

as

as the former, and ſhould cry *Myſtery*, and devoutly admire what I could not underſtand. Again, Shall my Faith be the Whirlwind of all the Niceties of Grammar, and over-raſh Criticiſm, that has nothing of certainty in it ſelf? No, no, my Faith has no other Foundation, but thoſe unvariable Truths, which are inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, and offer themſelves to the Eyes of any that can but read, without reaſoning, and Criticiſm, and in all ſorts of Verſions; no other Foundation but thoſe undeniable Facts, which the Sacred Writers have ſeen and heard, and are not tyed to the Method uſed by thoſe that relate them. The Holy Ghoſt has affected neither Hebraiſm nor Greciſm, neither improper nor figurative Speech, but the Expreſſions have depended upon the choice of the Writers, and internal Circumſtances, the Native Countrey, Genius, Education, Studies, *&c.* of the Pen-Men; or External, as Time, Places, Perſons, with whom they diſcourſe, *&c.* All theſe are liable to Variations, but the main Thing and the Body of the Eſſential Doctrines, is liable to no ſuch Variety. The Word of God does not conſiſt in meer Words, the Things chiefly are inſpired, not ſo much the Terms, wherein Men do, to no purpoſe, ſeek for Myſteries. The Apoſtles have oftentimes cited but the Senſe of the Old Teſtament-Scriptures, without any ſcruple for the Words. The Fathers did ſo too, when they cited the New-Teſtament. That Science of Words is a meer Jewiſh Superſtition, followed by the *Valentinians* and ſuch other *Gnoſticks*. Hence it was they found ſo many Secrets, which the latter Chriſtians did canonize as Capital Doctrines. I do not queſtion, but the moſt part of the various Readings that are in our Bibles, riſe from the Ancient Copies, their not having that Spirit of Cabal. They did not trouble themſelves about the nice Diſtinction between theſe Words, *Chriſt*, *Lord*, *God*; which they often confounded, and which are now adays the occaſion of ſo many Diſputes; becauſe they took them for Synonimous, not foreſeeing that time ſhould come, when Men would build great Myſteries upon a Word, to the great prejudice of the Genius of the Goſpel, and the Primitive Objects ſpread throughout it, which ought to fix a Senſe to all the reſt. They are charged with Malice, or Negligence. That may be. But it's probable enough, they did not alſo affect Diſtinctions in Words which they thought indifferent. Had the Evangelical Knowledge its ſtreſs in the Words, Tranſlations ſhould become meerly inſignificant and uſeleſs, becauſe they would overthrow the whole Myſtery. That is ſo true, that thoſe who have contrived certain Words to expreſs their Myſteries, do always keep them in their Original Majeſty, being moſt of them Greek or Latin, and moſt barbarous in our vulgar Tongues, as *Conſubſtantial*, *Hypoſtatical*, &c. Yea the very ſame Words were look'd upon as Strangers in their Native Countrey; for the Ancient Greeks did hardly agree about the Signification of the Word *Hypoſtaſis*, which makes it the more recommendable to our Orthodox. The ambiguous Signification of this Word making it very fit for the Myſtery, that is, to expreſs a thing utterly inexplicable, and incomprehenſible. They diſtruſt Scripture-Expreſſions, which the Hereticks will obſtinately retain: *Hereticks*, ſays a Modern Author, *have much more Reaſon to miſtruſt the Humane and Cabaliſtick Terms, which the Orthodox bring in with ſuch a Tyranny.* St. *Jerome* miſtruſted them in a Letter to Pope *Damaſus*, *Non ſufficit ſenſus*, ſays he, *ipſum nomen efflagitant, quia neſcio quid veneni in Syllabis latet*, — And *quia vocabula non edidiſcimus, Hæretici judicamur.* 'The Senſe is not ſuf-
'ficient, they exact of us the very Words,
'(*they force them upon us*) becauſe I know
'not what Venome lies hid under cover
'of the Syllables; — And becauſe we do
'not learn Words, we are accounted He-
'reticks. But the Confeſſion of St. *Auſtin* ſeems to me the moſt ingenuous that can be, (*De Trin.* l. 5. c. 9.) *Cum quæritur quid Tres? Magna prorſus inopia humanum laborat*

eloquium,

eloquium, dictum eſt tamen Tres Perſonæ, non ut illud diceretur, ſed ne taceretur : ‘ When Men ‘ ask, ſays he, what is meant by Three? ‘ all humane Speech comes too ſhort of it; ‘ yet we have ventured to ſay Three Per- ‘ ſons, not that we ſhould ſay that, but ‘ that we may not be ſilent. He is ſurely in the right, it were too ſhameful a Silence: Stout-hearted Divines muſt never hold their peace, let them rather utter extravagant Words; they pay nothing for them, and yet they'l ſerve turn for the People. Hence it is that the Ancients, who were wiſer than we, made up their Creed either only of undeniable Facts of God the Creator, and of the *Meſſias*, born, dead, riſen, *&c.* or of Primitive and unalterable Doctrines of Remiſſion of Sins, of the Reſurrection of the Body, *&c.* Compare with this Chriſtian Simplicity, our Confeſſions of Faith encreaſed to an infinite Bulk, and the Philoſophical and Cabaliſtical Creed of *Athanaſius*, which may ſerve the turn of a full Dictionary for Theological Gibberiſh. Read the Creed of the Apoſtles; every thing therein is agreeable to the Goſpel, and breaths the Simplicity which is in Chriſt. Read the Creed of the pretended *Athanaſius*. ‘ The ‘ Catholick Faith (ſays he) is this, That we ‘ worſhip One God in Trinity, and Trinity ‘ in Unity; neither confounding the Perſons, ‘ nor dividing the Subſtance. And ſo he goes on in the ſame tune, in a train of Burdens, which indeed might be look'd upon as a Song, with greater reaſon than that of the Nicene Creed, *God of God, Light of Light*, which *Calvin* calls *Cantilenam, a little Song.* Good God! Is it poſſible, that ſo ſtrange a Compoſition ſhould be look'd upon as the Foundation of Chriſtianity?

But ſuch Terms, ſay they, are made uſe of to fix the ſenſe of Scripture, and to diſtinguiſh Hereticks. Very well. But with ſuch Arms a Papiſt will be able to defend the moſt monſtrous Opinions. Do but diſtinguiſh Two Natures in the Perſon of Chriſt, he will alſo diſtinguiſh Two Manners of being in Chriſt's Body: a Sacramental Being, and a Natural Being; and with ſuch a Diſtinction, as with an impenetrable Shield, he will repel all the Darts ſhot againſt him. It is an eaſy thing to defend an abſurd Opinion, with a more abſurd Diſtinction. What will not Error do, when it gets ſuch a licence? Certainly as Metaphyſicks are but raſh Reaſonings, which go beyond the Limits preſcribed by God to the Objects of Reaſon: So the Confeſſions of Faith, which are puffed up with Metaphyſical Terms, are nothing elſe but a Debauch'd Faith, which launches beyond the juſt Limits, which God has ſet to its Objects. All the Myſteries which are ſpoken of in ſo ſplendid a way, are of this Nature. They are the Wandrings of an unruly and over-curious Fancy, which launches out from the Foundation of Religion, contained in the Primitive Objects of the Goſpel, to ſearch in every Word of the Revelation, ſuch Secrets as God never put there; finding every-where cunning Myſteries, as if Religion did conſiſt in Cabals and Subtilties. You'l ſay, it is an incomprehenſible Myſtery to our Finite Minds. You ſay ſo indeed; ſo will a Papiſt ſay of his pretended Myſtery, and they will both of them have me to ſubmit my Faith and my Reaſon. But it's ridiculous to require of me that I ſhould ſubmit ſuch things as I am ſure of, to a Revelation which is controverted. Do but yield the *Self* and *Mutual Conſciouſneſs* of the Doctor to a Papiſt, and the ſhift of Myſteries, it will be no hard matter for him to prove that a Million of Bodies are but one Body. With the help of ſuch a Method, a Pagan will eaſily clear himſelf of the charge of *Polytheiſm*. *Jupiter, Pluto*, and *Neptune* will be Three by Self-Conſciouſneſs, and will be but One by Mutual Conſciouſneſs. *Minerva, Venus*, &c. will be nothing elſe but the Vertues of that Supream and Infinite God. The one will be his Wiſdom, the other his Love, *&c.* by this Maxime of the Author, that, *What are Faculties in us, are Perſons in God*, pag. 189.. So that what he ſaid about Socinianiſm, *pag.* 252. will be found more ſuitable to his Orthodoxy, that,

it

It juſtifies Polytheiſm, and excuſes both Pagan and Popiſh Idolatries.

The *Socinians* are accuſed of Subtilty: this appears to me very ſtrange. The high and unintelligible Notions of the Orthodox are accounted ſacred Myſteries; but *Socinians* do no ſooner reduce all things to common Senſe and the Primitive Doctrines of the Goſpel, but it's look'd upon as Subtilty, violent and unnatural Explications. To inſiſt upon the Creed of the Apoſtles, wherein are contained the firſt Facts, and ſuch Facts as are not above the reach of any Man, is accounted Subtilty. What will then become of thoſe refined Metaphyſicks, Eſſence, Nature, Perſons, Modes, Conſubſtantialities, Hypoſtaſes, Self and Mutual-Conſciouſneſs; and of that Learning conſiſting in meer Words, whereof the Vulgar has no Idea, and which the Doctors themſelves utter without underſtanding them? *His Quæſtiunculis*, (ſays *Eraſmus* in his Notes upon the Firſt Chapter of the firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*) *ætas rerum omnium fugaciſſima conteritur, cum pleraque ſint ejus generis ut doctius neſciantur quam ſciantur, ut ridiculè quærantur, temerè definiantur. Breve tempus eſt, & arduum eſt negotium agere verè Chriſtianum. ——Os conſecratum eſt Evangelio, & nihil crepat niſi Averroem & Ariſtotelem* (add to it, *& Carteſium.*) ——*Neque minus peccant qui nobis objiciunt fumos Cabaliſticos & Talmudicos.* 'In 'theſe little Queſtions our Age, of all things 'the moſt fleeting, is conſumed, when as 'moſt of them are of that kind, that it's 'more learning to be ignorant of them than 'to know them; that they are ridiculouſly 'enquired into, and raſhly defined. The 'Time is ſhort, and it's a difficult matter to 'be truly Chriſtian.——Our Mouth is conſe-'crated to the Goſpel, and we crake nothing 'but *Averrois* and *Ariſtotle* (*I may add alſo* '*Carteſius*) —Neither are they leſs faulty, 'who preſent us with Cabaliſtick and Tal-'mudick Smoak. *Grotius* in his 6th Book *De Veritate Relig. Chriſt.* ſpeaking of *Conſtantius*'s Age, and thoſe that followed after, ſays, *Sicut olim Arbori vitæ prælata Arbor ſcientiæ maxima detrat mala, ita tunc quoque curioſa Eruditio pietati antehabita, & ex Religione Ars facta. Cui deinde conſequens fuit, ut ad exemplum eorum qui Turrim Babylonicam ædificabant, affectatio temeraria rerum ſublimium, diſſonas locutiones & diſcordiam pareret. Quibus plebs conſpectis, ſæpe neſcia quo ſe verteret, culpam in Sacras Litteras rejecit, eaſque tanquam venenatas cœpit fugere, Religio autem paſſim non in mentis puritate, ſed ——in ſtudia flagrante ſemel illectarum partium collocari cœpit, tandemque evenit ut multi ſint Chriſtiani nomine, re pauciſſimi.* 'As of old 'the Tree of Knowledg, preferr'd before the 'Tree of Life, brought upon us the greateſt 'Evils: ſo then alſo curious Learning 'eſteem'd more than Piety, and Religion 'being made an Art, *did the ſame.* For the 'Conſequence of that was, that after the 'Example of thoſe, that built the Tower of 'Babel, a raſh affectation of Sublime Things 'brought forth differing Speeches and Diſ-'cord: which the common People behold-'ing, and not knowing which way to turn 'themſelves, laid the fault upon the Holy 'Scriptures, and began to avoid them as 'pernicious; and Religion every where be-'gan to be placed not in the Purity of the 'Mind, but ——in flaming Zeal for the Parties 'they had once choſen; ſo at length it came 'to paſs there were many Chriſtians in name, 'but in reality very few. In effect, by the means of Myſtery, Divines have made Religion a very difficult thing, that is, an Art, which Chriſtians are not able to underſtand, (*Ex Religione Ars facta*, ſays *Grotius.*) Thereby they raiſed themſelves above common Chriſtians, and are made neceſſary to the People, improving that Art to their own Benefit. If Religion were eaſy and without any incumbrance, every one ſhould be Doctor to himſelf. Chriſtianity is by that means nothing elſe but the Religion of Learned Men, and of the moſt ſubtile and refined Philoſophers. Thoſe are eſteem'd the moſt excellent Chriſtians, who believe moſt Myſteries. Men will by no means have a Religion of a Level, which neither aſcends into Heaven, nor deſcends into the Deep, and whoſe whole Myſtery is nigh us, in the Faith of the Heart

and in the Confeſſion of the Mouth: *If thou ſhalt confeſs with thy Mouth the Lord Jeſus, and ſhalt believe in thy Heart that God has raiſed him from the Dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved*, Rom. 10. 9.

I know very well why they fancy the *Socinians* to be ſubtile Men it is: becauſe they oppoſe that vain Learning, which has been introduced into the moſt popular Catechiſms, and unto which moſt Men are inured. They oppoſe Prejudices, a corrupt and dark Tradition, an inveterate Cuſtom of judging of all things by Human Authority, which are the only Principles whereby we underſtand Scripture, ſince the time the God of this World has blinded our Underſtandings with the Smoak of a Cabaliſtical Talmud, a crude Scholaſtick Divinity, and an arrogant and uncertain Criticiſm. The Dirty Spring which has afforded this falſe Learning is the *Gnoſticiſm*, which boaſted of great Myſteries, but of no Holy Practices. They were the firſt Hereticks, who made Perfection to conſiſt in High Knowledg, and have heaped up Trinity upon Trinity; (*Vid. Concil. Bracar.* 1. *Art.* 2.) Men, it ſeems, are afraid of the low Eſtate and Sufferings of Chriſt, and think to ſhun theſe Reproaches made unto us by the Jews, by making him the Supream God. Thus they deſtroy his Unction, they take away from him his real Title of Chriſt, to beſtow upon him an imaginary One. He has been made God by the Hand of the Father, who crowned his Vertue and his Obedience with that excellent and glorious Name: and they will have him to be imaginarily ſuch by the Hands of Men, by a Title, which is not the Reward of his Sufferings. If it has been lawful for the *Homoouſians* to fancy a Chriſt or a Son of God, who did exiſt before him who was born of the Virgin *Mary*, without thinking of contradicting the Articles of the Creed, *I believe in Jeſus Chriſt the only begotten Son of God, who was conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, born of the Virgin* Mary, &c. *and ſits after his Sufferings at the right Hand of God*: which is the moſt excellent way, whereby a Man may be called the Son of God. Why ſhan't the *Papiſts* be allowed to contrive a Chriſt 1600 years after him that was born of a Virgin, who is born of a Morſel of Bread, conceived and formed by the words of a Prieſt, without any deſign of contradicting the ſame Article? Indeed it is an eaſier thing to make a Chriſt of a Morſel of Bread, than the Supream God of a Man. If the one diſtinguiſhes the Natures, the other will diſtinguiſh the Manner of exiſting: both of them will make uſe of Metaphyſicks, and by the help of ſuch Theological Inſtruments, each one will free himſelf from Difficulties, and it ſhall not be known which of them gets the better. In effect, each one will avoid the moſt preſſing Arguments, by contriving a Diſtinction more abſurd than the very Opinion which he maintains, one Abſurdity helping another; or by finding out a new Senſe of the Authority brought againſt him; for every Divine can eaſily ſhew, that the places objected againſt him, are capable of a Senſe, which is not contrary to him. One may eaſily ſee how convenient the Machin of probable Senſes is, which our Divines bring into their Diſputes: what an eaſy thing it is for them to free themſelves from preſſing Difficulties, and make new Overtures with thoſe famous Keys, 'of Tranſpoſition of Words or Clauſes, 'Errors of Copies, various Readings, various 'Meanings of the ſame Word, Punctuation, 'taking away or adding of the Negative Par-'ticle, Alluſion to Cuſtoms, Conſiderations 'of the Matter in Hand, Exaggeration, Inter-'rogation, Parentheſis, Literal Senſe, Figu-'rative Senſe, want of Exactneſs in the Sacred 'Writers, Prudence in concealing ſome things 'or in complying with ſome Opinions pre-'vailing in their Times, condeſcention to 'Pagans or Jews, uſing ſuch Ideas as prevail-'ed in ſuch a Religion, Prejudication in the 'Hearers, Anſwers ſuitable to their Needs 'rather than to their Queries, Compendious 'Expreſſions, Phraſeology of that Time, the 'Author's Nation and Native Countrey, Pa-'rallel Paſſages, Precepts peculiar to the A-'poſtles, Advices to Perfection, Cenſures a-'gainſt certain Hereticks, the Circumſtances 'of the Subject, the Scope of the Author, 'what goes before and what follows, the Bar-

'renneſs

'renneſs of the *Hebrew* Tongue, and conſe-
'quently its Ambiguity, its particular Idioms,
'the various Senſes of the ſame Verb in dif-
'ferent Conjugations, the want of certain
'ways of Expreſſion uſed in other Tongues,
'the Sublime and Metaphorical Expreſſions
'moſt frequent in the Oriental Languages,
'the Imitation of the Hebrew Idiom in the
'Lxx Verſion, and in the Original Text of the
'New Teſtament, Greek of the Synagogue,
'and ſuch like Keys of Solution very fit to
'eternize Diſputes. I do not deny but ſuch Means may be fit to find out the Truth, but it's only when controverted Truths are thereby brought to the Primitive and Undeniable Truths: that is to ſay, when care is taken that every thing be referred to the Analogy of Faith, to the Rule of Faith contained in the Creed of the Univerſal Church: then it is very proper to make uſe of them. Whereas it is a Source of Error, to uſe them in relation to a Syſtem, and to the particular Opinion of the Party wherein one finds himſelf engaged, which every one calls the Analogy of Faith; yet it is nothing but that particular Tradition, which we will not allow in the Church of *Rome*. So that the *Socinians* only, who refer every thing to the Primitive Truths, and to Undeniable Facts, may make uſe of thoſe Keys of Solution. Becauſe having Light on this firſt Foundation whereon to fix their Foot, they muſt needs make a good uſe of their Criticiſm; having, I ſay, this Primitive Truth on their ſide, that there is but One God, Creator of Heaven and Earth, and at the ſame time a Circumſtantiated Hiſtory of the Birth, Death, and Reſurrection of Chriſt, which, as all do confeſs, is an undeniable Proof that he was a Man.

Theſe two Principles being once acknowledged by Rational Men, who have a diſtinct Idea of the Nature of theſe two Beings, God and Man, they muſt of neceſſity fix upon this Ground the Senſe of all other Truths, which ſeem to contradict this avowed Truth, and expound them in a Senſe of Morality and of Diſpenſation, not in an Abſtract and Metaphyſical Senſe of Nature, Perſon, Eſſence, Hypoſtaſis, Generation, Proceſſion, Relation, Numerical and Specifical Unity, and ſuch like, which every one admires, crying Myſtery! Myſtery! but no Man underſtands. This is a Priviledge, which we make uſe of againſt the *Papiſts*. Whilſt they bring in the Letter, *This is my Body*; *My Fleſh is Meat indeed*, &c. they run themſelves to no purpoſe into long Criticiſms about the Words *Body* and *Fleſh*. They wander notwithſtanding their long Reaſonings, and make an ill uſe of thoſe Means fit to find out a true Interpretation; becauſe we ſhew that there is againſt them this undeniable Fact, that Chriſt took Bread, gave Bread; and this Primitive and Unmoveable Truth, that Chriſt aſcended into Heaven. Thus it ſtands with the Doctor and the Socinians: They will ſhew him that he can make no uſe either of the Letter of Scripture, or the Means of Solution allowed in a lawful Diſpute, without wandering moſt pitifully; becauſe there ſtands in his way this Primitive Truth, that *there is but One God*, and this Fact acknowledged by all, that *Chriſt was conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, and born of the Virgin* Mary. He can by no means make uſe of ſuch Methods, if he departs never ſo little from thoſe firſt Foundations of the Chriſtian Religion: but in referring every thing thereunto, he may. Otherwiſe he muſt fly to Metaphyſicks; but after all Pretences, the Metaphyſical Senſe is unknown to Scripture. All the Knowledge, which the Scripture affords us concerning God, is meerly Moral and Relative to us, but no ways Metaphyſical; for in that reſpect God being incomprehenſible, he cannot be revealed. So that whatever we know concerning the Divine Perfections, is Moral, and has a Relation to us, *viz.* that his Power has created us; that his Goodneſs is communicated to us, as unto his Creatures; that his Juſtice inflicts Puniſhment upon the Guilty, and Protects the Innocent; that his Mercy forgives them that Repent, eſpecially through Chriſt under the Goſpel; that the ſame Power that gives us Life and preſerves it, will be able to reſtore

it.

it again, when we have loſt it in his Service; that his Wiſdom knows how to conduct all ſorts of Means, in order to the Salvation of thoſe that love him, *&c.*

For example, I have a clear and diſtinct Idea, that nothing can eſcape his Hands, that nothing can ſteal out of his Sight. This Idea is ſufficient to ſettle my Faith in reſpect to his Omniſcience, and his Omnipreſence. But to know whether there is an Immenſity of Eſſence or of Operation, theſe are Metaphyſicks out of my reach, and are no Helps to the ſettling of my Confidence and Truſt in him. Therefore it is that Revelation does not ſpeak preciſely about this. Thus it is with the Unity of God. I have but a Moral, Natural or Popular Idea of this Unity, as much as One is oppoſite to Many; and thereby I underſtand an Idea, which is the ſame among all Men, to whom the Commandment of worſhipping One God has been delivered: The Lawgiver having given no Laws that ought to be taken in a Metaphyſical Senſe, which depends upon a heated Imagination, and varies according to the Humours, the Condition, the Climate, the Sect of Philoſophy, and the Prejudications of Men. According to the Stile of Laws, which is commonly ſimple and eaſy, by *God* we underſtand a Divine and Supream Perſon, one Numerical Being and Spirit, having the ſame Notion of that Unity, which we have of an Angel, a Man, a King, *&c.* The *Jews* being uſed to the Notion of the word *God*; if Chriſt and his Apoſtles had changed it, without warning them of it, by taking this word in a Senſe unknown to the Jewiſh Nation, underſtanding in a Metaphyſical way by God, *Three Beings*, and *Three Minds*, as the Doctor does: They ſhould have impoſed upon them by ſuch an Equivocation, which all of a ſudden changes the Natural Idea, which the Law afforded them of the Unity of God, unto a Metaphyſical Idea, whereby *Ariſtotle* himſelf might have been deceived: that Change being of ſuch a Nature, that there is no Law, tho never ſo plain and poſitive, but its Force and Authority might be thereby eluded.

But, ſay they, the Scripture ſpeaks of Chriſt as if he were the Supream God, aſcribing to him his Names, his Works, and his Perfections. I anſwer, that God in his Revelations ſuppoſes that we have ſome common Notions, which are derived either from Nature, or from a general Tradition, whereby we come to a diſtinct Idea of God, and of his Creatures, as much as we are concerned therein in order to our Civil or Religious Life. We know in that reſpect, what is a Spirit, a Body, One, and Many. This being ſuppoſed, the Scripture ſometimes runs it ſelf into figurative Expreſſions, which it would undoubtedly avoid, were it not that it ſuppoſes us to have ſufficient Knowledge to rectify them, and bring them to a Rational Senſe, ſuitable to the Nature of the things in queſtion. So that we cannot ſtumble at the Letter of thoſe Expreſſions, but by making an ill uſe of our Senſes, Reaſon and Conſcience. Therefore God will have us to be attentive to his Word, and to examine it with a ſincere Heart, and a diſcerning Mind, and free from Prejudices. As for inſtance, Scripture ſays that Chriſtians are *Partakers of the Divine Nature*; had it ſaid ſo much of Chriſt, *viz.* That the Father had communicated to, or *made him Partaker of his Divine Nature*, what matter of Triumph ſhould not this be for the Trinitarians? What could they ſay more poſitive for Conſubſtantiality, and for the Foundation of the Diſtinction, Nature and Perſons? Yet, ſuppoſe it had done ſo, I take it as matter of fact, that the Evangelical Hiſtory would afford us as many good Reaſons to rectify that Expreſſion in relation to our Saviour, as our Senſes and Reaſon do afford us to bring it to a fit and reaſonable Senſe in relation to Chriſtians Partakers of the Divine Promiſe. Thus the Scripture does not ſtick to attribute unto God, Hands, Eyes, Bowels, and a Thouſand ſuch Things, as would induce us to believe that he is Corporeal, did we not know either by the Idea which we have of the moſt perfect Being, or by ſome other plain and ſimple Expreſſions of

Reve-

Revelation, that God is a Spirit. For of two Expreſſions of Scripture, we are obliged to take in a literal Senſe, that which ſuits beſt our Natural Knowledge; and to look upon as Figurative, that which is contrary to thoſe Notions, being underſtood in a literal Senſe. Thus the Scripture calls the Euchariſtical Bread *the Body of Chriſt*, Magiſtrates, Angels, and the Meſſias *God*; becauſe it ſuppoſes that we may eaſily put a good Senſe upon theſe Denominations. Firſt, by ſome clear Paſſages of the Revelation, which teach us that Chriſt's Body is in Heaven; that God is One; that the *Meſſias* is a Man like unto us, whom, upon the account of his Obedience, God has raiſed to a Divine Authority: ſo giving us the Reaſon and Ground of that Denomination, which is taken, not from his Nature, but from his Obedience and his Offices. Secondly, By the Knowledge, with which he endowed us at our Creation, to make us capable of knowing and worſhipping Him, whereby we judge diſtinctly what is Bread, a humane Body, a God, a Man, *&c.* For this Natural Revelation continues ſtill, and is the Foundation of all other. When God ſaid to the *Iſraelites*, *The Lord thy God is One Lord, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve*, if thereby God meant One in Eſſence, and Three in Perſons, his Laws ſhould be more obſcure than the Oracles of the Falſe Gods. The Stile of the Laws (as I ſaid before) is Simple, Natural, and Popular, and they call One God, *One*, in the ſame ſenſe as we commonly ſay, an Angel, a Man; for there is a certain Language common to all Mankind, and certain Notions known to all Nations, which are like a Foundation to the Expreſſions of the Goſpel, of the Law, and of all ſorts of Revelation. What is then to be done with Men, who are ſo fooliſh as to make of all Abſurdities ſo many Myſteries? of a Man a Supream God? of a bit of Bread Chriſt? being not willing to make uſe of their Senſes, Reaſon, and Primitive Faith, *I believe in God*, &c. Such Men are incurable; for God has afforded no Remedy for their Cure. *Pervicaciæ nullum remedium poſuit Deus*; God has appointed no Remedy for wilful Obſtinacy.

It ought to be confeſt, Sir, that it would be a very eaſy thing to find out in Scripture the whole Will of God, as much as we are concerned therein, would we but read it with Humility and Reſpect, helped with our common Knowledge, free from Prejudices, and laying aſide that Learning falſly ſo called. Would we, I ſay, read it as we read the Proclamations of our Kings; regarding only their Will, without philoſophizing or criticizing upon the Words contained in them; being perſwaded that God ſpake as we commonly ſpeak; and that whatever Hebraiſm or Greciſm there is in his Word; yet he has caſt over it a certain Univerſal Intelligence, common to all Nations that are endowed with Speech, and grounded upon the common Notices of our Senſes and Reaſon; which is preſently perceived by any Rational and Unprejudiced Man, thô he have no skill either in Greek or in Latin. Take away Prejudices, and give way to common Senſe and Reaſon, which God does always ſuppoſe in all his Revelations; and then what can be for inſtance more eaſily refuted, than the Monſtrous Opinion of Tranſubſtantiation, which makes up the Capital Belief of the Church of *Rome?* When I give way to my Senſes in an ordinary courſe, without preventing them by the falſe Conceptions of my Mind: if any Body tell me by ſhewing the King's Picture, *Here's the King*, my Eyes ſee it is the King's Picture which they ſhew me; my Ears are determined by my Eyes to the true meaning of thoſe Words. So that *here's the King* will never produce in my Mind the Idea of the very Perſon of the King originally and really preſent. Thus in a Senſe of Religion and of Morality, when I hear Chriſt ſay, *This is my Body*, ſhewing me the Sacrament and Memorial of his Body, and at the very ſame time that my Ears hear theſe Words, *This is my Body*, my Eyes ſee it is the Image of Chriſt's Body, which he offers me in a Holy and Conſecrated Bread, to celebrate the Memory of his Death; and my Eyes teſtify to me

that

that this Bread remains Bread ſtill, even after the Divine Conſecration: then undoubtedly my Ears determined by my Eyes to the true Senſe of the Words, *This is my Body*, will in no wiſe produce in my Mind the Idea of a Corporeal and Natural Body of Chriſt. But they will ſay, Faith ought to produce it, ſeeing Chriſt ſaid ſo. I anſwer; I can have no Faith, but it muſt be grounded either upon my Senſes, or the ſight of a Miracle, or the hearing of the Word of God. Now there is no Miracle here, ſeeing my Eyes diſcover to me no miraculous Change of the Bread into the Body of Chriſt. On the contrary, they ſee Bread ſtill: but a Miracle conſiſts in ſhewing me, that that which was before true and proper Bread, is become now a true and proper Humane Body; or elſe it is a Miracle without a Miracle, a Myſtery without a Myſtery. Neither is there any hearing of the Word of God, ſeeing the hearing of thoſe Words, *This is my Body*, when their Senſe is indeterminate, is not yet the hearing of the Word of God, but only when their Senſe is fix't and determinate. And it is ſo only, when my Eyes cauſe me to reflect that I hear ſome Words concerning Bread: then the hearing of thoſe Words, *This is my Body*, (whereby could be meant the real Body of Chriſt, if my Eyes ſaw his true Body offered to me,) do now produce in my Mind only the Idea of the Figure of his Body. Becauſe my Eyes do ſee that thoſe Words are only ſpoken of a Sacramental Bread, as thoſe Words, *This is the King*, (whereby could be meant the Perſon of the King, if I ſaw they were ſpoken of the King himſelf) are determined by my Eyes to mean only the Picture of the King, becauſe I ſee they are ſpoken of a Picture.

Thus in like manner, theſe words of Chriſt, *Deſtroy this Temple*, might be meant of the Temple of *Jeruſalem*, as the *Jews* maliciouſly interpreted them, if Chriſt had ſhewed the Temple with his Finger in ſpeaking thoſe Words; and ones Ears ſhould be neceſſarily determined by ones Eyes to ſuch a Senſe. But if Chriſt ſpeaking thoſe Words, touched his own Body with his Finger, one could underſtand by his Words nothing elſe but the Temple of his Body, ſeeing our Ears would be determined by our Eyes to ſuch a Figurative Senſe. Whoever has no regard to this natural Rule of Language, is a falſe Witneſs againſt Truth, as the *Jews* were againſt Chriſt.

Let us apply this Obſervation to the Matter in Hand. As often as the Goſpel takes notice of Chriſt-Man as a God, this word God, which by it ſelf ſhould carry to my Mind the Idea or Notion of the Supream God, does carry always to it but the Idea of a Man, whom God has endowed with his communicable Perfections, and raiſed to a Supream Power: Becauſe the Primitive Facts of the Goſpel compel me to underſtand by this Word, not God himſelf, but his viſible Image, which the Apoſtles have ſeen with their Eyes, and handled with their Hands. For Inſtance, as it ſeems Natural to the Reformed Churches, to explain theſe Words, *This Bread is my Body*, by theſe, *This Bread is the Image and Figure of my Body*; methinks 'tis no leſs obvious to the *Socinians* to explain this Paſſage of St. *John*'s Goſpel, *The Word was God*, by theſe words, *The Word was the expreſs Image of God*. To conteſt the Parity of both theſe Explications would be a great Injuſtice. Thus when *Thomas* ſays, *My Lord and my God*: in theſe Words the Term *God* muſt be taken in a Senſe determined by the Eyes and the Hands of that Apoſtle, who had then thruſt his Hand into the Side of our Saviour; whereby I am taught that he ſpeaks of a Man raiſed from the Dead, and therefore made *God* by the Power of his Reſurrection. *Theodorus* of *Mopſueſta* puts another Senſe upon theſe Words, obſerving however the ſame Rule. Thus he ſays in his Comment upon St. *John*, *Thomas quidem quum ſic credidiſſet, Dominus meus & Deus meus dixit: non ipſum Dominum & Deum dicens (non enim Reſurrectionis ſcientia docebat, & Deum eſſe qui reſurrexit,) ſed quaſi pro miraculoſo Facto Deum collaudat.* 'Thomas having thus believed, ſaid, 'my Lord and my God, not ſaying that the 'Lord Chriſt was God, (for the knowledge 'of the Reſurrection did not teach him that 'he

' he who was raiſed was God,) but he praiſes ' God as it were for a miraculous Work. Indeed the knowledge of the Reſurrection does not teach that a Man, who dies, and is raiſed from the Dead, is the Supream God, who created Heaven and Earth. So true it is that a Fact which I ſee, and a Thing which I touch, ought to prevail over a Word in order to the Determination of thoſe Words, *My Lord and my God*. Thus when Chriſt ſays, *Before Abraham was, I am:* this Expreſſion might induce me to believe, that Chriſt means a natural manner of Being; were it not that my Ears are determined by my Eyes to excite in my Mind the Idea of quite another Exiſtence, ſince he who ſpeaks thus, is not yet Fifty Years Old, as the *Jews* obſerved. Thus the *Jews* might have perceived, had they been willing to hear him patiently, and for their Inſtruction: but they ſeek to oppoſe him, and tell him, *Thou haſt ſeen Abraham*, which indeed ſhould be underſtood of a Corporeal and Natural Sight: Whereas he had ſaid, that *Abraham had ſeen him*, or rather *his Day*; which could only mean a Moral and Spiritual View. His meaning was, that he was *before Abraham* in the ſame manner as *Abraham had ſeen him, viz.* in the Divine Promiſe, he being the promiſed and deſtinated *Meſſias*. For Faith is a Demonſtration and View of things, that are not ſeen, but are preſent by Promiſe. And thereupon the *Jews*, who waited for a Pretence, make as if they did not underſtand him, and take up Stones to caſt at him. A true Image (to ſay ſo by the way) of all Perſecutors, who put a wrong Senſe upon the beſt things; and of ſtarcht Bigots, who underſtand every thing amiſs, and teſtify againſt the Truth: and that is ſufficient to make one be purſued, condemned, and burnt. I could go on, Sir, in ſuch a way, through the Explication of other controverted Paſſages, eſpecially on the Firſt of *John:* but I hear the Doctor is about a Second Volume, intending to refute the *Socinians* by Scripture, and in a more direct way than he has done: Therefore I expect him, and will not prevent him.

As for Tradition, I do declare beforehand, that if it can be proved, that the Church has been Catholick in Charity as well as in Faith, I admit heartily of ſuch a Tradition. The Orthodox, who will have every one think what they themſelves think, ſhould be aſhamed to ſay, that the Church in all Ages, and the Oecumenical Councils held the ſame Belief, and condemned the contrary. I will not inſiſt upon the Falſhood of this Aſſertion, which has been acknowledged by ſeveral Learned Men; but I anſwer in a Word, that when every one ſhall enjoy the Liberty of examining and ſpeaking what he thinks, without endangering his Reputation, his Eſtate, his Employments, and his Life: then I will confeſs that this Prejudication about Multitude may be well-grounded. But ſince ſuch a Liberty has never been allowed, and the Secular Arm, the Inquiſition, the Croiſado's, and the Penal Laws have endeavoured to ſettle and preſerve the Faith, as far as we are acquainted with it by the Hiſtories of paſt Ages, and of our Own; I am ſo far from being moved by ſuch an Argument, that I am inſpir'd with a juſt Indignation againſt thoſe who dare to uſe it. Faith and Tradition have thus been forced upon Men, and they are ſo at this Day, not only by Violence, but by a conſtrained and unnatural Inſtruction. For they inſert into Catechiſms and Liturgies (which Children read before Scripture) ſome Metaphyſical Scraps to expreſs certain Opinions, which excite ſuch Ideas, as no Rational Man would ever come at by reading the Scripture. For the Natural Impreſſion made by the Apoſtles Creed, offereth not to wiſe and unprejudic'd Men, the Senſe of the Comments, which are at this Day added to it by a forc'd Inſtruction: But ſuch an Inſtruction, though ſtrange and unnatural, becomes ſo natural by a long uſe, that the moſt ſimple Explications of the Word of God are pre-

 ſently

ſently accounted New and Unnatural, when they depart never ſo little from that unlucky Prejudice. Oh! Strange Blindneſs! Men ought not to call ſuch an Explication unnatural, as does not ſtick to the Letter in its ſtrict Senſe; the Letter being capable of a Figurative Senſe, or of any other that is not ſo obvious: But they ought to ſtyle ſo an Explication, which has no regard to the Circumſtances of the Text, the Nature of the Matter in Hand, the Genius and Spirit of the Revelation, the Primitive and Undeniable Doctrines, and what is certain in the Facts mention'd in Scripture, and in the Principles of Natural Notions. Whilſt Proteſtants will not follow ſo ſure and infallible Guides, they will continue divided from one another by reaſon of a Thouſand Diſputes, which keep at a diſtance ſeveral honeſt Men, and lay themſelves open to their Adverſaries the Papiſts.

All the Explications of Scripture made uſe of by the ſeveral Sects of Proteſtants, who look upon it as the Rule of their Faith, *Lutherans*, *Calviniſts*, *Socinians*, &c. make at moſt but probable Senſes, until they uſe thoſe Keys of Solution above mentioned, in relation to the Firſt Truths contained in the Scripture. For the probable Senſes are not ſufficient to ſettle our Faith; we want a certain and undeniable Senſe. We challenge the Doctor to afford us any ſuch, but by explaining the Scripture, either by the help of an infallible Tradition or Judge, if he has any ſuch; or in reſpect to the Primitive and unmoveable Doctrines. Now according to this laſt Method, the Divinity of Chriſt is not ſo much as probable in a Senſe of Nature; whereas the Senſe of Unction and Offiee is altogether neceſſary. The way therefore to put an end to our Quarrels, is to reduce all things to ſome certain Foundations, upon which we may rely in examining the reſt. Simple Chriſtians may ſtick to thoſe Primitive Objects, which are the only neceſſary Things; and Divines may make uſe of them as a moſt infallible Rule of Faith, to ſeek for all the other leſs neceſſary, and remote Truths. The Neceſſity of this Maxime does appear by the Uncertainty and Incumbrance of all our Diſputes, eſpecially of this; wherein it's an eaſy thing to ſhew, that according to this way of arguing by the Sole Letter of the Scripture, and the Metaphyſical Reaſonings, which ſet at naught the moſt certain Principles of our Natural Light, under pretence of Myſtery: according to this Method, I ſay, may be proved, (in as plauſible a way as the Trinity is proved,) the moſt abſurd and extravagant Belief of the Corporeal Preſence.

Now, Sir, for the right underſtanding of my way of Reaſoning, you will be pleaſed to remember what I told you more than once; that I have no ſhare in thoſe Factions, which moſt pitifully tear in pieces Chriſtianity; that I am neither a *Papiſt*, nor a *Lutheran*, nor a *Calviniſt*, nor a *Socinian*, &c. I am a Chriſtian I thank God. I ſide only with Truth, and take ſhelter in the Boſom of that Catholick Church, which ſtands independently upon any thing that goes under the Name of a Party. I mean, that I do not give up my Faith to thoſe particular Confeſſions of Faith, which every Sect endeavours to enlarge to an Infinite Bulk. I reſolve my Syſtem into the Creed of the Univerſal Church, which by reaſon of its Antiquity, but eſpecially of the Authority of its Doctrines, is rightly called the Apoſtles Creed, and admitted of all Chriſtians, notwithſtanding their implacable Hatreds and Diviſions. The Learned Dr. *Mygget*, in a Sermon preached before the King and Queen on *Rom.* 12. 5. believes that ſuch a Faith is ſufficient, in order to Salvation, if accompanied with a Good

Good and Holy Life. 'All the *Credenda*, 'ſays he, that the Ancient Church required 'of them ſhe admitted to her Communion 'for ſome Ages, was only an Acknowledg-'ment of the Articles of the Creed we 'call the Apoſtles, and preſt no more on 'them; and though all Churches ſince 'have added others, ſome more, ſome 'leſs, it appears by their not judging one 'another, about receiving or not re-'ceiving them, this is not ſo much from 'any Opinion they have of the Abſolute 'Neceſſity of holding thoſe Articles, as of 'the Abſolute Neceſſity of preſerving 'Peace among their own Members, who 'were like to make diſturbance about 'them. And again; 'Our Contentions, 'ſays he, are not about the great vital 'Truths of Chriſtianity, whereunto we 'have all attained, but ſome additional 'Notions, which if they ſhould be true, 'our Conſciences tell us, Men may be 'ſav'd, though they don't believe. Thus far the Doctor. In effect one may diſpute about thoſe *Additional Notions*, *Salvâ fide qua Chriſtiani ſumus*, as St. *Auguſtin* ſays. I ſhould tranſcribe the Doctor's whole Sermon, if I would ſet down all that he ſays in the behalf of this Principle. To this Doctor we may joyn Dr. *Sherlock* himſelf, who ſpeaks of the Church of *England* thus; (*The Knowledg of Chriſt*, *p.* 95.) 'I 'admire, ſays he, the Wiſdom and the 'Honeſty of our Church, which in her 'Publick Catechiſm hath been careful to 'prevent the Cheats and Deluſions of 'Fancy; feeds her Children with whol-'ſom and ſubſtantial Food; has taught 'them a Religion without Art and Sub-'tilty; —— hath taught them the Apo-'ſtles Creed, which contains thoſe Great 'and Eſſential Articles of Religion, which 'are the neceſſary Principles of Action, '— without filling their Heads with No-'tions and Artificial Theories of Religion, 'which ſerve only to make them giddy 'with a vain conceit of Knowledge, to 'talk ill, and to live worſe. I am a Pro-teſtant upon ſuch Terms, and heartily em-brace the Communion of the Church of *England*, independently upon any Faction whatſoever. And ſure enough 'tis not againſt her I do write, but only againſt the Doctor's *Three Gods*, and his New Impoſi-tion of believing *Self* and *Mutual Conſcious-neſs* in order to be ſaved. On the contra-ry, I do chearfully congratulate that Church, foraſmuch as the Doctor did not find in her ſimple and wiſe Catechiſm, (which he juſtly commends) the Artificial Theo-ries, and New Devices of his *Self* and *Mu-tual Conſciouſneſs*, whereby he not only makes Children giddy, but moreover troubles the Brains of the moſt ſteady Doctors.

The Rule of my Faith therefore is the Holy Scripture, and (which is all one) the Tradition which is contained in the Apo-ſtles Creed, which is the Univerſal Creed of the Chriſtian Church. This Symbol is ſufficient: as to other Points, wherewith it is encreaſed, 'tis the Iniquity of the Age which makes them neceſſary. If the Proteſtant Church has the Power to force upon me the Expoſitions ſhe gives of thoſe Two Rules of my Faith, how much more will the Church of *Rome* lay claim to the ſame Right? Let them tell me therefore, which of thoſe Two Churches is the Truſtee of ſuch Expoſitions? The Proteſtant Church pretends, that the Senſe which She gives to the Scripture on the Myſtery of the Trinity, is of an Apoſtolical Tradition and unqueſtionable Evidence, which I ought to ſubmit to. The Church of *Rome* lays the ſame claim concerning the Expoſition of the Myſtery of the Euchariſt, and main-tains that the Proteſtants are bound to re-ceive it at her hand. Who ſhall decide the Queſtion? Let then the pretended He-reticks alone, or agree firſt between your ſelves upon the Point. The Doctor con-feſſes himſelf (*in the Vindication of Dr.* Stil-lingfleet, *pag.* 279.) that the Apoſtles Creed

is little else than the Explication of the Form of Baptism, what we are to believe of God the Father, what of God the Son, and what of the Holy Ghost. Now if the Creed is the Explication of the Form of Baptism, and contains what we are to believe of the Father, *viz.* that he is the Maker of Heaven and Earth; and of the Son, *viz.* that he was born of a Virgin by the Holy Ghost, *&c.* we ought then to keep to the Primitive and Old Explication of Scripture. And therefore what need is it, to explain that Exposition by a New Exposition contained in the Creed of *Nice?* And this by a Third, contained in the Creed of *Constantinople?* And then by a Fourth, contained in the *Athanasian* Creed? and so infinitely. There were one *Cerinthus*, and other Hereticks, when the Apostles Creed was composed, be it never so old, and therefore the same necessity of expounding the *Eternal Generation*, the *Consubstantiality* and *Hypostasis* then: and yet it clearly appears, that the Creed does not condemn any, but those who held that *Jesus* was a meer Man, born of *Mary* by *Joseph sensu carnali*. And the *Consubstantiality*, which it establisheth, is, that *Jesus* is Consubstantial to Men according to his Birth of the *Virgin*, and Consubstantial to God according to his Conception of the *Holy Ghost*, whereby the Father has in some manner communicated his Essence to him. Since *Consubstantial* is so much in Vogue now adays, here's a very Ancient and Evangelical One, here's the great Mystery of the Christian Religion; a *Messias* born of a *Virgin* by the Power of the *Holy Ghost*, having no other *Father* but *God* himself. This is a wonderful Mystery full of Astonishment. Nothing can be conceived more glorious for the Religion and its Author. Such has been in all times the Faith of the People, I mean the Faith of the Apostolical Creed. As to the Creed of *Nice* or *Athanasius*, it was the Faith of those who spoke *Platonick* or *Peripatetick* Philosophy: but which never descended to simple Christians, except perhaps by the means of Blind and implicit Faith. They were both conveyed to us, the One by a Natural Tradition; the Other by a violent One. However there is no reason to look for the Faith of former Ages in the Philosophical Writings of the Fathers: 'tis rather the Scholastick Divinity of those Times. We must look for the common Faith of that Primitive Church in the People themselves; and then indeed we shall find it such as Divine Providence did preserve it in the Apostles Creed. Thus Christ as sent by his Father, his Promises, and his Precepts make up the whole of the Gospel; *For this is Life Eternal, to know Thee the* only *true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* This Abridgment of the Christian Faith contains the whole Mystery of Salvation, and all the main Truths, without which I could not obey the Precepts, nor hope for the Rewards.

The Ancient and Modern *Donatists*, who monopolize Salvation, including it in their Sole Party, are for that very reason *Hereticks*, *Schismaticks*, and excluded out of the Catholick Church. It's to no purpose that the Doctor says, we too much sacrifice to our Reason, because we will have no such Mysteries, as go under so fine a Title, because they are full of Absurdities. Let him say himself, if it be not to build ones Religion (I will not say upon Reason, but) upon the Fancy and Wanderings of Mens Minds, when we make it depend upon our weak Reasonings, and uncertain Consequences. As for us, we acknowledg no other Foundation of Faith, than the Primitive Facts and Truths of the Gospel, which are of such an Evidence and Certainty, as no rational Men can deny. Whereas the Orthodox, who swell Religion and Confessions of Faith, have no other Prop of their Faith, and consequently of their Salvation, than Human Reasonings, distracted Metaphysicks,

taphyſicks, and bold Criticiſm: Means that have not been able, ever ſince they were put in practice, to fix the ſenſe of one ſingle Paſſage. On the contrary, they have hitherto bereav'd us of well received and undoubted Senſes. We muſt therefore take Scripture for the only Rule of our Faith, and admit its Primitive Truths with a clear and diſtinct Belief. But, as to the Truths leſs neceſſary, implicit Faith is ſufficient: that is to ſay, they muſt be received with ſuch a Diſpoſition of Mind, as fits us to believe them explicitely, aſſoon as they appear clearly; and we ought to be fully convinced that they are Scripture-Truths.

This being laid down, Sir, it's no hard matter to reſolve Two Difficulties, the Solution whereof will however appear to you a Paradox. The Firſt is, that the *Papiſts*, who have choſen a wrong Principle, do notwithſtanding agree in the Tradition of their Church: Whereas the Proteſtants, who have a right One, do notwithſtanding diſagree about the Senſe of Scripture. I anſwer, That both of them having enlarged their Confeſſions of Faith with an infinite Number of Opinions, either uſeleſs, or ſtrange, or odious to Religion, and having thereupon laid hold on two different Principles to defend them: Thoſe have had the good luck of chuſing a falſe Principle, whereon their Hereſies are grounded, and conſequently a Principle which clears, confirms and reconciles them; becauſe it is contrived on purpoſe to be the Rule of their Errors. But theſe have had the ill Fortune of chuſing a true Principle, wherein their new Opinions cannot be found, and therefore a Principle, which condemns, confounds, and divides them; becauſe it was not made to be the Rule of their New Doctrines.

The Second Difficulty, which gives a great deal of trouble to ſeveral Men, is, That there are many *Deiſts*, who lead a ſtricter Life, than moſt of thoſe who boaſt ſo much of Chriſtianity. I anſwer, that it may very well be, and this is my Reaſon: Thoſe *Deiſts* ſpoken of, are moſtly well-natured Men, and would not be Deiſts, were they well taught the Chriſtian Religion. So far are Divines from laying open her Beauty to their Eyes, that they keep them back by the ugly Pictures which they draw thereof. Thoſe Men are entertained with abſurd Myſteries, Paſſages of Scripture wreſted, wherein every one finds a ſenſe that favours his Party. Theſe things are a Stumbling-block to Men of Probity and Underſtanding. In effect they are ſincere honeſt-hearted Men, who do good by the impulſe of their Natural Religion, Honeſty and good Conſcience, which have great influence upon them. And there is no doubt but they would give Glory to the Truth of the Goſpel, did it ſhine unto them in its Native Evidence and Simplicity. But it's certain that Religion, as it is now adays beheld, affrights thoſe that are in the neareſt Diſpoſition to Chriſtianity, and whoſe Minds ſeem not fitted to embrace the abſurd Opinions of a Religion. On the contrary, it draws into its Boſom all Worldly-minded Men, who are always in a readineſs to ſubmit their Faith to the moſt monſtrous Myſteries, provided they may not incur the loſs of their darling and cheriſh'd Paſſions. Let their Luſts be but indulged, they will willingly ſacrifice common Senſe, Reaſon, and Faith. Thus Religion has been ſo well ſuited to Worldly Men's Reliſh, that (if I may dare to ſay ſo) moſt wicked Perſons are willingly Chriſtians, and ſeveral honeſt Men are accounted Prophane and Indifferent. Theſe Ill Effects, that ariſe from ſuch a Corruption, are eſpecially to be aſcribed to Teachers. O that God would be pleaſed to bring us back to that ſimple, but efficacious Truth, which had ſo great an Influence

upon

upon the first Hearers of the Gospel, and inspire us with a solid Piety, and a true Christian Charity! I shall conclude with this brief, but essential Confession of my Faith, *That after the way which they call Heresy, so worship I the God of my Fathers, believing all things that are written in the Law, and the Gospel; and have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a Resurrection of the Dead, both of the Just and Unjust; and herein do I exercise my self to have always a Conscience void of Offence towards God, and towards Men.* I am,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

FINIS.

A

Brief Hiſtory

OF THE

UNITARIANS,

Called alſo

SOCINIANS.

In Four LETTERS,

Written to a Friend.

ACTS 17. 11.

They ſearched the Scriptures daily, Whether thoſe things were ſo?

The Second Edition, Corrected; with ſome Additions.

Printed in the Year, 1691.

The First Letter

Concerning the

UNITARIANS,

Vulgarly called

SOCINIANS.

SIR,

IN Answer to yours, demanding a brief Account of the *Unitarians*, called also *Socinians*; their Doctrine concerning God (in which only they differ from other Christians; the *Remonstrants* professedly agreeing with them in other Points of Faith and Doctrine) and the Defence they usually make of their Heresy. They are called *Socinians*, from *F. Socinus*, an Italian Noble-man, and a principal Writer of their Party. They affirm, God is only One Person, not Three. They make our Lord Christ to be the Messenger, Minister, Servant, and Creature of God; they confess he is also the Son of God, because he was begotten on blessed *Mary* by the Spirit or Power of God, *Luke* 1. 35. But they deny, that he or any other Person but *the Father* (the God and Father of the said our Lord Jesus Christ) is God Almighty and Eternal. The Holy Ghost, or Spirit, according to them, is the Power and Inspiration of God, *Luke* 1. 35.

That the Lord Christ was a Man, the Son, Prophet, Messenger, Minister, Servant, and Creature of God; not himself God, is proved, they think, by these Arguments.

1. If our Lord Christ were himself God, there could be no Person greater than He; none that might be called his Head, or his God; none that could in any respect command him. But the Holy Scriptures teach, that *the Father* is greater than Christ; is the Head, and the God of Christ; and gave Commandment to him, what he should *Say*, and what he should *Do*. John 14. 28. *My Father is greater than I.* 1 Cor. 11. 3. *The Head of Christ, is God.* John 20. 17. *I ascend to my Father, and your Father, to my God, and your God.* John 12. 49. *The Father which sent me, he gave me a Commandment, what I should say.* John 14. 31. *As the Father gave me Commandment, so do I.*

2. If our Lord Christ were indeed God, it could not without Blasphemy be (absolutely, and without Restriction) affirmed of him, that he is the Creature, the Possession, the Servant, and Subject of God: or that for his Obedience, he was rewarded and advanced by God. But the Inspired Authors of Holy Scripture do say, that the Son our Lord Christ is the Creature of God, the Possession of God, the Servant of God; was obedient to God, and for that cause by him rewarded and exalted; also that when God shall have subjected all Men to his Son our Lord Christ; yet even then shall he remain subject to God. Col. 1. 15. *The First-born (from the Dead,* ver. 18.) *of every Creature.* Heb. 3. 1, 2. *Consider the Apostle and High-Priest of our Profession, Jesus Christ, who was faithful to him that made him.* So 'tis in the Greek, and in the Margin of our Bibles. 1 Cor. 3. 23. *Ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's.* Mat. 12. 17, 18. *That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by* Isaiah,—*Behold my Servant.* Phil. 2. 8, 9. *He humbled himself, and became obedient,—Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name above every Name.* 1 Cor. 15. 28. *When all things shall be subdued to him, then shall the Son also be subject to him that put all things under him, that God may be All in All.*

3. He that is true God, is not the Minister, or Priest of any other Person or Persons; he neither doth nor will (being himself Omnipotent and All-sufficient) mediate or intercede with any whomsoever, for his Servants and People. But 'tis certain, that our Lord Christ is the Minister, and Mediator of God and Men; a Priest that appeareth in the Presence of God, and interceedeth with him for Men. Heb. 8. 6. *Now hath he obtained a more excellent Ministry.* 1 Tim. 2. 5. *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Jesus Christ.* Heb. 2. 17. *A merciful and faithful High-Priest in things pertaining to God.* Heb. 9. 24. *Christ is not entered into the Holy Place made with Hands, but into Heaven it self, now to appear in the Presence of God for us.* Heb. 7. 25. *He ever liveth to make Intercession for them.*

4. Almighty God doth all things in his own Name, and by his own Authority; he ever doth his own Will, and seeketh his own Glory; he declares himself to be the prime Object of Faith and Worship, and pronounces all Doctrines and Religions to be vain which proceed not from him alone. But in our Lord Christ all things are contrary; for he declares, that he came not into the World in his own Name or Authority, nor to do his own Will, or seek his own Glory, or propound himself as the principal Object of our Faith or Worship, or to publish a Doctrine of his own. John 17. 28. *I am not come of my self.* John 5. 43. *I am come in my Father's Name.* John 8. 42. *I proceeded forth, and came from God; neither came I of my self, but he sent me.* John 5. 30. *I seek not my own Will.* John 8. 50. *I seek not my own Glory.* John 12. 44. *He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me.* Phil. 2. 11. *That every Tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father.* John 7. 16. *My Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me.*

5. God was always most wise, never ignorant of any thing; he needeth not the concurrence of any other Person, to assure him that he judgeth right. He needeth not be tried by Temptation. And as he is infinitely Great, so he is no less Good. But the Sacred Writers do not speak of the Lord Christ after this Tenor. They say of him, that he increased in Wisdom; that he professed himself ignorant of some things; that he ascribed the certainty and infallibility of his Judgment, to the Father's Presence with him; that he was tried by great Temptations, being thereto exposed by the Holy Ghost; that he refused to be called Good, on this account, that only God is Good. Luke 2. 52. *Jesus increased in Wisdom;* — *and in Favour with God and Men.* Mark 13. 32. *Of that day and hour knoweth no Man* (in the Greek 'tis, *None* knoweth) *no not the Angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.* St. *Matthew* adds, *But the Father only,* Mat. 24. 36. John 11. 34. *Where have*

ye laid him? They say unto him, Lord, come and see. John 8. 16. *My Judgment is true, for I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me.* Mat. 4. 1. *Then was Jesus led of the Spirit, to be tempted of the Devil.* Luke 18. 19. *Why callest thou me, Good? There is none good save one, that is God.*

6. God giveth what and to whom, himself pleaseth; he needs not the Aid of any other; he intreateth not for his People, much less for himself; he cannot die, and he deriveth his Power from none but himself. But 'tis certain, that the Lord Christ could not himself, without the previous Ordination of the Father, confer the prime Dignities of Heaven, or of the Church; he placed his Safety in the Father's Presence and Help: He prayed often and fervently to the Father, not only for his Disciples, but for himself: He died, and was raised from the Dead by the Father. After his Resurrection he received of *Another* that great Power which he now enjoyeth; but so, that the Father reserveth to himself some principal Regalities. Mat. 20. 23. *To sit on my right Hand, and on my left, is not mine to give; but* [it shall be given] *to them for whom it is prepared of my Father.* John 8. 29. *He that sent me, is with me; and the Father hath not left me alone, for I always do those things that please him.* Luke 22. 42. *Father, if thou be willing, remove this Cup from me.* Heb. 5. 7. *Who in the days of his Flesh, offered up Prayers and Supplications, with strong Crying and Tears, unto him that was able to save him.* John 17. 20. *Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe in me through their word.* Ephes. 1. 19, 20. *According to the mighty working of his Power; Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the Dead.* Mat. 28. 18. *Jesus came and spake to them, saying, All Power is Given to me.* Acts 1. 7. *It is not for you to know the Times and Seasons, which the Father hath put in his own Power.*

7. The Lord Christ is in Holy Scripture described to be the Son of God, and the Image of God. Luke 1. 35. *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee* (Blessed Mary) *and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also* (or, and therefore) *the Holy Thing that is born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.* John 3. 18. *He that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed on the Name of the only-begotten Son of God.* Col. 1. 15. *The Image of the Invisible God.* 'Tis (say the *Socinians*) as impossible, that the Son or Image of the one true God, should himself be that one true God, as that the Son should be the Father, or the Image that Thing whose Image it is; which they take to be simply impossible, and contradictory to common-sense, which Religion came not to destroy, but to improve.

8. Our Lord Christ is by the sacred Writers, to *distinguished from*, and *opposed to* God, that it amounts to as much as an express denial that he is God. Nothing that is God can be distinguished from, or opposed to God; for Distinction and Opposition suppose Diversity. 1 Cor. 15. 28. *Then shall the Son also be subject to him, that put all Things under him, that God may be all in all.* Phil. 2. 11. *That every Tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.* Rom. 16. 27. *To God only-wise, be Glory through Jesus Christ.* 1 Tim. 2. 5. *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Jesus Christ.* Luke 18. 19. *Why callest thou me, Good? there is none good save one, that is God.*

9. Very many Texts directly affirm, That only *the Father* is God. John 17. 1, 3. *Father, — this is Life Eternal, that they know thee* [*the only true God*] *and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* Or, *Jesus Christ* thy Messenger. 1 Cor. 8. 6. *But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all Things, and we in him; and one Lord* (or Master, *i. e.* Teacher) *by whom are all Things.* In the Greek, *One Lord, Jesus Christ; for whom are all Things, and we for him.* All Things were originally made with respect to Christ; that is, with intention to subject them (*in the fulness of time*) to him, and to constitute him Heir and Lord of them, under God his Father. So saith the Apostle, Heb. 1. 2. *Whom he* (God) *hath*

hath appointed Heir of all Things: Or, when 'tis here and elſewhere ſaid of Chriſt, *for whom are all Things*, it may be meant and underſtood *Eventually*, i. e. It hath ſo happened, that all Things are his, and made for him; ſo the wiſe unerring Providence of God hath ordered, ſo the Lord Chriſt hath deſerved. But to reſume the Texts belonging to this Ninth Argument. Eph. 4. 4, 5, 6. *One Spirit, — one Lord; — one God and Father of All, who is above All.* 1 Cor. 15. 24. *Then cometh the end, when he* (Chriſt, ver. 23.) *ſhall deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father.* James 3. 9. *Therewith* (with the Tongue, ver. 8.) *bleſs we God, even the Father.* Rom. 15. 6. *With one Mind, and with one Mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.*

10. If the Lord Chriſt were indeed God as well as Man, or (as *Trinitarians* ſpeak) *God the Son* incarnate in an Humane Nature; it had been altogether ſuperfluous, to give the Holy Spirit to his ſaid Humane Nature, as a Director and Guide. For what other help could that Nature need, which was one Perſon with (as they ſpeak) *God the Son*; and in which *God the Son* did Perſonally dwell? Luke 4. 1. *Jeſus being full of the Holy Ghoſt, departed from* Jordan. Acts 1. 2. *After that he through the Holy Ghoſt* (i. e. through Direction and Motion of the Holy Spirit, and Inſpiration of God) *had given Commandments unto the Apoſtles.* Acts 10. 38. *God anointed Jeſus of* Nazereth *with the Holy Ghoſt.*

11. Had the Lord Chriſt been (as *Trinitarians* ſpeak) *God the Son* joined to an Humane Nature; he could not have aſcribed his miraculous Works to the Holy Ghoſt, or to the Father, dwelling in him; but to the Son, dwelling in him and united to him; much leſs could he ſo expreſly deny, that himſelf was at all Author of them. *John* 5. 30. *I can do nothing of my ſelf.* John 14. 10. *The Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the Works.* Mat. 12. 28. *I caſt out Devils, by the Spirit of God.* Acts 2. 22. *Jeſus of* Nazareth, *a Man approved of God among you, by Miracles and Wonders and Signs, which God did by him in the midſt of you.*

12. Had our Lord been more than a Man, the Prophecies of the Old Teſtament, in which he is promiſed, would not deſcribe him *Barely* as the Seed of the Woman; the Seed of *Abraham*; a Prophet like unto *Moſes*; the Servant and Miſſionary of God, on whom God's Spirit ſhould reſt. Gen. 3. 15. *I will put Enmity between thy Seed, and her Seed. Her Seed* is by all Interpreters underſtood to be Chriſt. Gen. 2. 18. *In thy Seed ſhall all the Nations of the Earth be bleſſed.* This again is univerſally interpreted of Chriſt. *Deut.* 18. 18. *I will raiſe them up a Prophet from among their Brethren like unto thee, and I will put my Words into his Mouth.* This is interpreted of our Lord Chriſt in many Texts of the New Teſtament; as *John* 1. 45. *Acts* 3. 22. *Acts* 7. 37. Iſaiah 42. 1. *Behold my Servant, whom I uphold; mine Elect, in whom my Soul delighteth: I will put my Spirt upon him, and he ſhall bring forth Judgment to the Gentiles.* This is interpreted of Chriſt, at *Mat.* 12. 17, 18.

Now that the Holy Ghoſt or Spirit, is only *the Power* and *Inſpiration* of God; at leaſt is not himſelf God; and that Almighty God is not a Trinity, but only one Divine Perſon; They hold is aſcertained by theſe Conſiderations.

1. The Holy Ghoſt or Spirit, and the Power of God, are ſpoken of as one and the ſame thing. Luke 1. 35. *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee,* (Bleſſed *Mary*) *and the Power of the Higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee.* 1 Cor. 2. 4, 5. *My preaching was not with inticing words of Man's Wiſdom; but in Demonſtration of the Spirit and of Power; that your Faith ſhould not ſtand in the Wiſdom of Men, but in the Power of God.* Luke 11. 20. *I with the Finger of God* (that is, by the Power of God, *Exod.* 8. 19.) *caſt out Devils.* What this Finger or Power of God is, he declares at Mat. 12. 28. *I caſt out Devils by the Spirit of God.* Acts 6. 5. *They choſe* Stephen, *a Man full of Faith, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* Ver. 8. *And* Stephen, *full of Faith and of Power, did great Wonders.* Here again, The Holy Ghoſt at ver. 5. is explained

plained by Power, ver. 8. Compare alſo *Luke* 24. 49. with *Acts* 1. 4, 5, 8.

2. A manifeſt Diſtinction is made as between God and Chriſt, ſo alſo between God and the Holy Spirit, or Power and Inſpiration of God: ſo that 'tis impoſſible the Spirit ſhould be God himſelf, in any other ſenſe than as the Attributes of God are ſometimes called God. Rom. 8. 27. *He* (the Spirit, v. 26.) *maketh Interceſſion for the Saints, according to the Will of God.* 2 Cor. 13. 14. *The Grace* (or Favour) *of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghoſt be with you.* Rom. 5. 5. *The Love of God is ſhed abroad in your Hearts, by the Holy Ghoſt which is given to us.* They note here, that God's Spirit or Inſpiration, being deſigned to be a continual Director and Guide to the Faithful, is ſpoken of, in theſe and ſome other Texts, *as a Perſon:* by the ſame Figure of Speech, that *Charity* is deſcribed as a Perſon, 1 *Cor.* 13. 4, 5. And *Wiſdom*, Prov. 1. 2. and 9. 1, *&c.* And the Law or *Commandments* of God, *Pſal.* 119. 24. And *the Word of God*, of which we have this Character, Heb. 4. 12, 13. *A Diſcerner of the Thoughts and Intents of the Heart; neither is there any Creature that is not manifeſt in his ſight; but all things are opened and naked unto the Eyes of him.* They note alſo, that in ſome Texts 'tis called the *Holy* Ghoſt, and *Holy* Spirit; in the ſame ſenſe that we commonly ſay, the *Holy* Wiſdom, or *Holy* Will of God.

3. The Spirit is obtained for us of God, by our Prayers; therefore it-ſelf is not God. Acts 15. 8. *God which knoweth the Hearts, bare them witneſs, giving them the Holy Spirit, as he did to us.* Luke 11. 13. *How much more ſhall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit, to them that ask him?* If we ſay, theſe Texts are to be underſtood, not of the Perſon of the Holy Ghoſt, but of his Gifts and Graces: The *Socinians* readily confeſs it, but they ſay alſo, that if the Holy Spirit were at all a Perſon, much more a God, his Gifts and Graces would be beſtowed by himſelf, and asked of himſelf; not beſtowed by, and asked of *another Perſon*, as 'tis manifeſt (and by All confeſſed) they are in theſe Texts. They add; There is neither Precept nor Example in all H. Scripture, of Prayer made to the Spirit, on this or any other occaſion; which (on the Trinitarian Suppoſition) that the Holy Spirit is a Perſon and God, no leſs than the Father, is very ſurprizing, nay utterly unaccountable.

4. If the Holy Spirit, and our Lord Chriſt, are Gods, or God, no leſs than the Father; then God is a Trinity of Perſons, or Three Perſons: but this is contrary to the whole Scripture, which ſpeaks of God as but one Perſon; and ſpeaks *of* him and *to* him by ſingular Pronouns, ſuch as *I, Thou, Me, Him*, &c. which are never uſed but of ſingle Perſons. Job 13. 7. *Will ye ſpeak wickedly for God? —Will ye accept his Perſon?* Heb. 1. 1. *God —hath in theſe laſt times ſpoken to us by his Son, —— the expreſs Image of his Perſon.* Deut 6. 4, 5. *Hear, O* Iſrael, *the Lord our God is one Lord; and thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thine Heart.* In the *Hebrew* thus, O *Iſrael*, hearken to *Jehovah* our God: *Jehovah is one*, and thou ſhalt love *Jehovah* thy God with all thy heart. The Jews by a moſt ancient Tradition and Cuſtom, are obliged to repeat this Verſe every Morning and Evening, to keep it in perpetual Memory, that Jehovah, or God, is one only, and not two or three. Iſa. 45. 5. *I am the Lord, — there is no God but ME.* Mat. 4. 10. *The Lord thy God, HIM only ſhalt thou ſerve.* Pſal. 102. 25. *O my God, —of Old haſt THOU laid the Foundation of the Earth.* No Inſtance (ſay the *Sicinians*) can be given in any Language of *Three Perſons*, who ever ſpoke of themſelves, or were ſpoken to, by the ſingular Pronouns, *I, Thou, Me, Him, Thee*, &c. Such ſpeaking is contrary to Cuſtom, Grammar, and Senſe, which are the Laws of Speech: therefore the Holy Scriptures always ſpeaking thus of God, either he is only *one Perſon*, or the Scriptures are one continued ungrammatical Soloecism and Impropriety, and that in the Capital Article of Faith, which no reaſonable or good Man can or ever will allow. For it no way helps the *Triuitarians*, that God ſays (according to ſome Tranſlations) *Let us make Man*, Gen. 1. 26. Becauſe nothing is ſo uſual in common Speech, as for ſingle Perſons

ſons to ſpeak of themſelves, indifferently by ſingular or plural Pronouns. So St. *Paul* in one and the ſame Verſe varies the Pronoun; 2 Cor. 10. 2. *I think to be bold againſt ſome, who think of Us; as if We walked according to the Fleſh.* Firſt *I*, then *Us* and *We*. That he ſpeaks of himſelf only, is put out of doubt by *ver.* 10, 11. of that Chapter. *His Letters (ſay they) are weighty and powerful, but his bodily Preſence is weak, and his Speech contemptible: Let ſuch an one think this, that ſuch as We are in Word by Letters, ſuch will We be alſo in Deed, when We are preſent.* See alſo at *ver.* 1. Briefly, they contend that when God ſpeaks of himſelf in the plural Number, or by plural Pronouns (which yet ſome Learned Interpreters deny, he ever does, as we ſhall ſee hereafter; and if he does, 'tis not above once or twice in the whole Scripture) he ſpeaks according to the Cuſtom of ſingle Perſons. eſpecially Princes and great Perſons, in all Languages: but were Almighty God *Three Perſons*, they could *Never* ſpeak of themſelves, or be ſpoken to, by the ſingular Pronouns, *I, Thou, Thee, Him, Me*; becauſe 'tis contrary not only to Grammar, (which is always to be obſerved, when there is no Cuſtom to the contrary) but to the Cuſtom of all Languages, and of all Nations who underſtand to ſpeak intelligibly and ſenſibly.

5. Had the Son, or Holy Spirit, been God, this would not have been omitted in the Apoſtles Creed. This Creed, ſay they, which is of next, if not equal Authority to any part of Holy Scripture, after having declared that God is *the Father Almighty*, and *Maker of Heaven and Earth*; ſpeaks not a Word of the God-head or Divinity of the Son, or Holy Ghoſt. It deſcribes the Son by all the Characters of a Man, *and by ſuch only*. For it ſays, he was Conceived or Begotten by the Holy Ghoſt on the Virgin *Mary*, that accordingly he was born of her; that he was Crucified, Died, and was Buried; that he aroſe again on the Third Day, and aſcended into Heaven. All theſe are the Deſcriptions of a Man. For God cannot be Conceived, or be Born, or Die, no nor aſcend into Heaven, becauſe he is always there, as well as elſewhere. Not content to take *no notice* that Chriſt is God, this Creed diſtinguiſhes him very plainly from God (that is, denies him to be God) by adding, that *He ſits on the right Hand of God*, i. e. He is advanced to be next to God, or, is under the particular and immediate Protection of God. Concerning the Holy Ghoſt, this Creed ſays no higher thing than it ſays of *the Church*. *I believe* (εἰς πνεῦμα ἅγιον) *in the Holy Ghoſt*; and (εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν καθολικὴν) *in the Holy Catholick Church*. So this Creed is read in all the Greek Copies, and ſo alſo 'tis recited by St. *Cyril*, by St. *Cyprian ad Epiſt. Numid.* and by *Socrates Hiſt. l.* 1. *c.* 26. If the Compilers of this Creed had believed, that either the Son or the Spirit is God; 'tis unaccountable that they ſhould take no notice of it in a Creed, and ſuch a Creed as was purpoſely drawn up to repreſent the Eſſential and Neceſſary Articles of the Chriſtian Religion. If a *Socinian*, ſay they, were to make a Confeſſion of his Faith, he would do it in no other Words, but theſe of the Apoſtles; and on the contrary, no *Trinitarian*, after having deſcribed *the Father* by all the Characters of God (ſaying, he is *God*, Almighty, and *Maker of Heaven and Earth*) would fail to mention the Divinity of the Son and Holy Spirit. Whence we muſt needs infer, that the Compilers of this Creed believed as the *Socinians*, not as *Trinitarians* believe concerning God, our Lord Chriſt, and the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, ſome *Spaniſh* Jeſuits and other Learned *Trinitarians* (quoted by *Sandius* in his *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* and by *Cingallus Script. Trin. Revel.*) have not ſpared to own, that the Creed, called the Apoſtles Creed, is a *Photinian* Creed, and does not acknowledg the Divinity of the Son or Spirit.

6. That God is, and that he is the Maker of this Beautiful and Immenſe World which we inhabit, is proved againſt the Corpuſcular Philoſophies, and againſt thoſe who have held the Pre-eternity of the World, or that it always was: by thoſe numberleſs Deſigns and Contrivances that we ſee in the whole, and in all the parts of it. So many and ſo admirable

Aims,

Aims, Deſigns, Ends, and *Contrivances,* as are viſible in the Heavens, in this our Earth, and in the Structure of (eſpecially) *the Human Body and Mind,* and of Seminal Forms, do moſt evidently ſhew, that they had a Maker equally deſigning and powerful. This is ſo clear, that I doubt, whether Atheiſm has been *the Abiding* Sentiment of any Man? One may be a while ſhockt or puzled (or even perverted) by a Doubt or Objection, or be ſwayed by an Intereſt or Luſt, or be under the Power of a Temptation, or of a Melancholy either Whimſey or Frenzy, and thus (as it were, and for a ſhort time) loſe ſight of God; as Clouds may a while hide the Sun: But the Contrivances and Ends, in the Parts of the World, in the very leaſt of them, are ſo numerous and undeniable, that we ſoon behold again the Maker of all things, more conſpicuous and bright than ever. And the very Doubts we formerly had, do now confirm us in the belief of a Divine Mind. We are ſo much more aſſured of ſuch a Mind, than that there is in us a Mind which reaſons, and contrives, and performs many ſorts of Works, far above the Powers of *Chance* or *blind Neceſſity:* by how much the Effects and Works of that Divine Mind, are more numerous, admirable and ſenſible, than our Acts and Works are. Thus (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks at *Rom.* 1. 20.) *The inviſible Things of him, even his eternal Power and Godhead, are — underſtood by the things that are made.* But that there is *but one God,* we know firſt, and moſt clearly, by Revelation. Then, by this Conſideration, that one God is *ſufficient*; and as in the viſible World or Created Nature, there is nothing (as the Philoſopher obſerves and ſpeaks) *in vain*; much leſs is there, or can there be in the Divine Nature, any thing *uſeleſs, needleſs and ſuperfluous.* Who ſeeth not, That One Almighty moſt Wiſe and good God is *ſufficient,* as ſufficient as a Thouſand; and, that more ſuch Beings were *needleſs and ſuperfluous?* But if they are needleſs and in vain; they cannot be, becauſe there can be nothing ſuperfluous in the Divine Nature. This is the moſt uſual and allowed Argument of all Parties, to prove, that there is but One God. But then, ſay the *Socinians,* it no leſs proves, that there is but One Divine Perſon, not a Trinity of ſuch Perſons. Is not (ſay they) *the Father* Almighty, moſt Wiſe and Good, Perfect God; in a word, *All-ſufficient?* Yes, The very *Trinitarians* confeſs he is; becauſe if he were not, he ſhould not be God at all. Therefore, ſay the *Socinians,* there neither is, nor can be any other Divine Perſon: and this is juſt as certain and evident, becauſe there is *the ſame Reaſon* of it; as 'tis certain and evident, that there is and can be *but One God.*

7. To conclude; Theirs (they ſay) is an accountable and a reaſonable Faith; but that of the *Trinitarians* is abſurd, and contrary both to Reaſon and *to It-ſelf*; and therefore not only falſe, but *impoſſible.* For you, ſay they teach, That there are Three *Almighty, moſt Good and moſt Wiſe* Perſons, and yet but One God; as if every *Almighty moſt Wiſe and Good* Perſon were not a God, a moſt Perfect God; and conſequently Three ſuch Perſons, Three Gods. You add yet more abſurdly, That there are Three Perſons who are *ſeverally and each of them* true God, and yet there is but One true God. This is *an Error in counting* or numbring; which, when ſtood in, is of all others the moſt brutal, and inexcuſable: and *not to diſcern it, is not to be a Man.* But we would not, ſay they, trouble our ſelves at the Non-ſenſe of this Doctrine, if it did not impoſe falſe Gods on us; by advancing Two, to be Gods, who are not ſo: and rob alſo the One true God, of the Honour due to him, and of which he is jealous.

This, Sir, is the Doctrine of the *Unitarians,* more commonly called *Socinians,* concerning Almighty God; and theſe their Arguments: which I have ſo related, as not to judg or rail of their Perſons; becauſe however Learned and Reaſonable Men (which is their Character among their worſt Adverſaries) may be argued out of their Errours, yet few will be ſwagger'd or jeer'd or chode out of them. It remains, that I make a

brief and fair Deduction of their Hiſtory; from the time that they have been taken notice of in the World.

They whom we call *Socinians*, were by the Fathers and firſt Ages of Chriſtianity, called *Nazarens*; by which name St. *Paul* is accuſed before *Felix*, Acts 24. 5. As *Nazarens* was their firſt Name, ſo afterwards they were called *Ebionites*, *Mineans*, *Artemonites*, *Theodotians*, *Symmachians*, *Pauliniſts*, *Samoſatenians*, *Photinians*, and *Monarchians*. The Writings of theſe Ancients are all loſt, being deſtroyed by the *Arians*, and *Catholicks*; notwithſtanding, they had (I find) ſome conſiderable Men among them. As 1. *Theodotian*, who tranſlated the Old Teſtament out of the Hebrew into Greek, about the Year of our Lord, 182. 2. *Symmachus*, who publiſhed another Tranſlation, from the Hebrew alſo into Greek, in the Year 193. *Euſebius* aſſures us both theſe were *Ebionites* or *Nazarens*; and their Tranſlations were ſo generally eſteemed, and uſed in the Greek Churches, that together with the *Verſions* of *Aquila* and of the Lxx, they made the τετραπλᾶ (or, fourfold Tranſlation) of *Origen*, the moſt celebrated Work of Antiquity. *Origen* eſteemed the Tranſlation of *Theodotian*, above all others; and where the Lxx wanted any thing, which was in the Hebrew; he ſupplied it in the words of *Theodotian*'s Tranſlation. 3. *Paulus* of *Samoſatum*, Biſhop and Patriarch of *Antioch*: A Man not only Learned and Eloquent, but ſo much eſteemed in that Capital City of the Eaſt, that an Epiſcopal Council there aſſembled, were not of ſufficient Authority with the City, to caſt *Paul* out of St. *Peter*'s Chair, or accept another Biſhop in his room. 4. *Lucianus*, The moſt Learned Perſon, without peradventure, of his Age. The Copies of the Lxx publiſhed by *Origen*, being much corrupted; *Lucian* corrected them according to the Hebrew Original. St. *Jerom* ſays, That *Lucian*'s Edition of the Lxx was uſed in all the Eaſtern Nations and Churches, from *Antioch* to *Conſtantinople*. Being of the Opinion of *Paulus* of *Samoſatum*, he did not communicate with the Biſhops of *Antioch*, who ſucceeded *Paul*, but held Meetings or Conventicles of his own. He was Martyr'd in the *Dioclesian* Perſecution. 5. *Photinus*, Biſhop of *Sirmium*: A General Council was aſſembled to judge and depoſe him, but his City would not part with him till the Emperour ſent an Army to expel him: For all that, they recalled him; and he ſo planted his Doctrine among them, that it overſpread (and was the Religion of) the *Illyrican Provinces*, till the Papacy on the one hand, and the Turk on the other, ſwallowed up thoſe Provinces.

Euſebius (*l.* 5. *c.* 28.) and *Theodoret* (*Hæret. Fab. l.* 2. *c. de Artemon*;) ſay, that theſe *Nazarens* conſtantly affirmed, that they derived their Doctrine from the Apoſtles of our Lord, and that it was the General Doctrine of the Church, till the Popes, *Victor* and *Zepherin*, ſet themſelves to root it up. *Victor* (ſay the *Socinians*) began to perſecute the Apoſtolic Doctrine of but One God, or (what is the ſame) that God is One, in the Year, 194. but with little ſucceſs; till that which was afterwards the Doctrine of the *Arians*, grew into general Credit and Acceptance. For *Juſtin Martyr*, *Origen*, and other principal Fathers teaching (as the *Arians* afterwards did) that *the Father* is indeed before the Son and Holy Spirit, in *Time*, in *Dignity*, and in *Power*; yet that *the Word* or Son, who in fulneſs of time took our Nature on Him, was Generated or Created ſome time before the World, and was the Father's *Miniſter*, *Servant*, and *Inſtrument* in making the World; and that the Holy Ghoſt was the Creature of the Son, and ſubſervient to him in making all Things: This Doctrine being advanced by *Juſtin*, *Origen*, and others of note in the Church; and ſeeming *more for the Honour of the Son*, than the plain and ſimple Doctrine of the *Nazarens*, did (by the help of Perſecution) prevail againſt theirs, and became (awhile) the more current Doctrine of the Church. But in the Council of *Nice*, *Arianiſm* was condemned, and a Doctrine *more popular than that* (and ſo more taking) did generally obtain, being ſupported

ported by Imperial Authority, and Penal Laws. This new Doctrine attributed to the Son, *Eternity*, and *Equality with the Father*. But did Superſtition ſtop here? No, ſay the *Socinians*; for there ſhortly aroſe another Doctrine, that the Son and Holy Spirit are *the ſame God with the Father*. *The ſame God*, not only (as the Nicene Fathers explained this Matter) by Unity of Will and Affection, and by *ſpecifical* Unity or Sameneſs of Subſtance, but by numerical or true Unity, Identity, and Sameneſs of Subſtance and Nature. This laſt has been eſtabliſhed by ſo many terrible Penal Laws, partly obtained of the Roman Emperours by Catholic Biſhops; partly made by Popes in the times of their Omnipotence; that now not only the *Nazaren* Faith, but the *Arian*, and the *Nicene* (properly ſo called) are no where openly profeſt in the Territories of Chriſtian Princes and States; except in a few Cities of *Tranſilvania*, in the Dominions of the *Czars* of *Moſcovy*, and (by *Connivance*) in ſome Parts of the United *Netherlands*. But in the Turkiſh and other Mahometan and Pagan Dominions, where alſo the Conquer'd Provinces of Chriſtians have Liberty of Conſcience; the *Nazaren* and *Arian* Churches are very numerous. Much of the New Conqueſts of his preſent Imperial Majeſty, in *Hungary*, *Sclavonia*, and *Illyricum*, are *Arian*.

But though the open and avowed Profeſſion of the Unity of God (as 'tis taught by the *Nazarens*, or *Socinians*, and by the *Arians*) be ſuppreſt; yet 'tis obſerved, that not a few of the moſt celebrated and learned Writers of the Church, whether Catholic or Reformed, have certainly been either *Arians* or *Socinians*, or great Favourites of them; though they have uſed much caution in ſo expreſſing themſelves, as not to lay too open to Exception, Envy, or Legal Proſecution.

1. *D. Eraſmus*, the Reſtorer of Learning, has given occaſion both to his Friends and Enemies, to think him an *Arian*. He ſaith, that *Phil.* 2. 6. was the principal Argument of the Fathers againſt the *Arians*; but that to ſay true, it proves nothing againſt them. He notes on *Epheſ.* 5. 5. that the word *God* being *uſed abſolutely*, doth in the Apoſtolic Writings, always ſignify *the Father*. In his *Scholia* on the third Tome of St. *Jerom's* Epiſtles, he denies, that the *Arians* were Hereticks; He adds, that they were ſuperiour to our Men in Learning and Eloquence. 'Tis believ'd, *Eraſmus* did not make himſelf a Party to that, which he eſteemed the more ignorant and dull ſide. In his Epiſtle to *Bilibaldus*, He ſpeaks more openly than the then Times would permit a cautious Man to ſpeak; I (ſaith *Eraſmus*) could be of the *Arian* Perſwaſion, if the Church approved it.

2. *H. Grotius* is *Socinian* all over. This Great Man in his younger Years attacked the *Socinians* in a principle Article of their Doctrine. But being anſwer'd by *J. Crellius*, he not only never replied, but thankt *Crellius* for his Anſwer; and afterwards, writing Annotations on the whole Scriptures, he interpreted every where according to the Sentiments of the *Socinians*. There is nothing in all his Annotations, which the more ſtrict Followers of *Socinus* his Doctrines, do not approve and applaud. His Annotations are a compleat Syſtem of *Socinianiſm*, not excepting his Notes on the firſt Chapter of St. *John's Goſpel*; which are written ſo artificially, and interwove with ſo many different Quotations, that he has covered himſelf, and his ſenſe of that Portion of Scripture, from ſuch as do not read him carefully.

3. *D. Petavius*, the moſt Learned of the Jeſuits, has granted, That the Fathers (generally) who lived before the *Nicene* Council, and whoſe Writings are preſerved, agreed in their Doctrine concerning God, with the *Unitarians*, that is the *Nazarens* or *Photinians* (now called *Socinians*) and the *Arians*; and concerning the Son our Lord Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, with the *Arians*. For 'tis to be noted, That the *Arians* and *Socinians* agree in their Doctrine concerning God; they both ſay, that he is only one Perſon, even the God

and Father of our Lord Christ; but they differ concerning the Son and Holy Spirit. The Son, according to the *Arians*, was generated or created some time before the World; and in process of time, for great and necessary Causes, became Incarnate in our Nature; he was also the Father's Instrument and Minister in the Work of Creation: The Holy Spirit (they say) is the Creature of the Son, and subservient to him in making all Things. These are they, to whom God says, *Let there be Light, Let there be a Firmament, Let us make Man*, &c. But the *Socinians* acknowledg but *one Maker* and Creator, as they know but *one God*. They deny therefore, That the Son our Lord Christ had any Existence, before he was born of Blessed *Mary*, being conceived in her by the Spirit, Energy, or Power of God. Farther they teach, That the Spirit is the Energy, Power, and Inspiration of God: saving that Mr. *Biddle*, and those that follow him, take the Holy Spirit to be a Person; prime Minister of God and Christ, chief of the Heavenly Spirits, and therefore called *the Spirit* by way of Excellence; and the *Holy* Spirit, to discriminate him from *Satan*, Prince and Chief of the Wicked and Apostate Spirits. This difference notwithstanding, because they agree in the principal Article, that there is *but one God*, or *but one who is God*; both Parties (*Socinians* and *Arians*) are called *Unitarians*, and esteem of one another as Christians and true Believers, as may be seen on the part of the *Arians* in their Historian *Chr. Sandius* (*Hist. Eccl. l. 1. c. de Paulo Samosat.*) and for the *Socinians* in the Disputation of *Alba*. But to return to *Petavius*; He often affirms, that the Doctrine of the Trinity, and the Divinity of the Son and Spirit, cannot be proved by Scripture only: and, that those who have attempted it, have always been baffled. He adds, There is no way to unity in the Church about these Matters; but by contenting our selves to speak concerning them, as the Fathers who lived *nearest to the Apostles Times* did speak. This last plainly shows what his meaning was.

4. *S. Episcopius*, so much esteemed by our English Divines, seems to have been an *Arian*. He saith, The Father is so first, as to be first in Order (*i. e. Time*) in Dignity and in Power. He saith, That Three equal Persons in God or in the Godhead, make Three Gods. He denies, That the Lord Christ is the Son of God by substantial Generation, that is, by Generation from the Father's Substance or Essence. Speaking of the Creeds that express the Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity, and the Divinity of the Son and Spirit, he saith, That Bishops in General Councils being led by *Fury, Faction*, and *Madness*, did not so much compose as huddle up Creeds for the Church. See for these things, *Episcop. Theol. Institut. l. 4. c. 32, 33, 34.*

5. *C. Chr. Sandius*, a Gentleman of prodigious Industry and Reading, and no less Ingenious than Learned, in all his Books refuses (*in Words*) to be called either *Arian* or *Socinian*, but has written an Ecclesiastical History in Quarto, with *Addenda* to it, *Coloniæ*, 1678; on purpose to prove, That all Antiquity was *Arian*; and, That the Unitarian Doctrine has been reduced so low by the Persecutions of *Rome*, and the Puissant Arms of *Charles* the Great, and other Kings of *France*. For which Service, those Kings have been requited by the Roman *Pontif*, with the Titles of *Most Christian Kings*, and *Eldest Sons of the Church*. He has also (under the borrowed Name of *Cingallus*) written a small Treatise with this Title; *Scriptura Trinitatis Revelatrix*: Here under pretence of asserting the Trinity, he has (as much as he could) defeated all the Strengths of the Catholic Cause; and shews, that there is no considerable Text objected to the *Arians* or *Socinians*, but is given up as an incompetent and insignificant Proof, by some or other of the principal Criticks and Authors, who were themselves *Trinitarians*; so that among them, they have given away the Victory to their Adversaries.

But, Sir, I perceive I have drawn out this Account of the *Socinians*, to already a sufficient length for a Letter: I will therefore conclude with a Passage out of Dr. *Burnet's*

Second

Second Book of *the History of the Reformation abridged*. *George Van Parr*, a Dutch-man, refused to abjure; so he was burnt in the Year 1549. (*by virtue of a Law or Writ, since abolished by Act of Parliament*) for affirming, that *only the Father is God*, and denying the Divinity of the Son our Lord Christ. He had led a very exemplary Life, for Fasting, Devotion, and a good Conversation; and suffered with extraordinary Composedness of Mind. These things cast a great blemish on *the Reformers*: It was said, They condemned Cruelty, only when acted on themselves; but were ready to practise it, when they had power. The Papists made great use of this, in the next (Queen *Mary's*) Reign: and what Archbishop *Cranmer* and Bishop *Ridly* (*Authors of Van Parr's* Punishment) suffered in her time, was thought a just Retaliation on them, by that wise Providence, that disposes all things justly to all Men. Thus far Dr. *Burnet*, the *Eusebius* of our Age.

SIR,

I am most

sincerely Yours.

A Second Letter

Concerning the

UNITARIANS,

Vulgarly called

SOCINIANS.

SIR,

THE Texts and Arguments from them, objected to the Doctrine of the *Unitarians* or *Socinians*, concerning God, are so many; that 'tis impossible to give a tolerable account of what they answer to the Orthodox, *in a Letter:* their Answers would require a Volumn. But not to disappoint you in your Expectations and Demands; I will *in several Letters* lay before you, what, and in what manner they reply to us. First, How they explain the Texts out of the Old Testament, which we object to them; then, how those out of *the Gospels* and *Acts*: Lastly, How the Texts out of *the Epistles* and *the Revelation.*

The Texts out of the Old Testament, are of two sorts. 1. Those which singly and alone prove the Trinity, or the Divinity of the Son or Spirit. 2. Those which (perhaps) would not, if alone considered, prove the Orthodox Doctrine; but do it sufficiently, when compared *with*, and explained *by* some Texts of the New Testament. I will propound both these in *the Order of Scripture.*

(1.) Genesis 1. 1. *In the beginning God* (Heb. *Elohim*) *created the Heaven and the Earth.* *Elohim* being a Word of the Plural Number, must denote more Persons than One in God. *Answ.* God says to *Moses*, Exod. 7. 1. *See I have made thee a God* (Heb. Elohim) *to Pharoah.* Was *Moses* more than one Person? 1 Sam. 28. 13, 14. *I saw Elohim ascending out of the Earth. He* (Saul) *said, what form is he of? She said, an old Man cometh up.* The Woman saw *Elohim: Saul* asks what form is *HE* of? Therefore he did not by *Elohim* understand more Persons. The Woman describes *Elohim* to be *an Old Man*; and thereby assures us, that neither did she by *Elohim* mean more than one Person. Therefore we have not well translated that Text, *I saw GODS ascending out of the Earth: Pagnine* very judiciously translates

translates it, *Vidi* D IVUM *aſcendentem*; i. e. I ſaw a Divine (or Auguſt) Perſon aſcending.

(2.) Gen. 1. 26. *Let* US *make Man in* OUR *Image.* It muſt be allowed, that Almighty God ſpeaks here of himſelf *Twice* in the Plural Number; therefore he is more Perſons than One. *Anſw.* This Text has been conſidered in the foregoing Letter, where it was ſhewn, that ſingle Perſons ſpeak of themſelves indifferently by Singular or Plural Pronouns; but more Perſons *never* ſpeak of themſelves, or are ſpoken to, by Singular Pronouns, or in the Singular Number, as the Scriptures generally ſpeak both *to* and *of* God. 2. But it is alſo farther to be obſerved, that ſome Rabbins render the Original *Hebrew* thus; *Let Man be made in our Image.* Meaning (ſay they) in the likeneſs of God and Angels; for he ſpeaketh to the Angels who were all preſent, *Job* 38. 4, 7. Yet God ſpeaketh to them, not as Adjutants, but Spectators of his Work. They note, that this Tranſlation agrees with the Stile uſed all along in this Chapter. Ver. 3. *LET there be Light.* Ver. 6. *LET there be a Firmament.* Ver. 20. *LET the Waters bring forth.* Ver. 24. *LET the Earth bring forth the Living Creature.*

(3.) Gen. 3. 22. *God ſaid, The Man is become as one of* US, *to know Good and Evil.* Here again is a Plural Number, importing more Perſons in God. *Anſw.* 1. *Onkelos* and *Oleaſter* render the Words more truly thus, *The Man is become one, knowing (of himſelf) Good and Evil*, i. e. Himſelf now knows Good and Evil, after having eaten of this Fruit. 2. Others content themſelves to ſay, that God ſpeaks here to the Angels; So *Grotius.*

(4.) Gen. 11. 6, 7. *The Lord ſaid, Let* US *go down, and there confound their Language. Anſw.* 1. Here alſo the *Hebrews*, *Lyranus*, and others, ſay that God ſpeaks to the Angels, *as the Miniſters and Executors of his Decree.* 2. Others tranſlate here, *Let their Language be confounded.* Which is an Hebrew Phraſe, ſignifying, *I will confound their Language:* For ſo he ſaith, *Gen.* 1. 3, 6, 20, 24, 26. *LET there be Light: LET there be a Firmament: LET the Waters, LET the Earth bring forth; LET Man be made*; that is, I will make Light, I will make a Firmament, I will cauſe the Waters and the Earth to bring forth, I will make Man. Note, That God is ſaid *to go down*, becauſe his Power accompanied his Angels, who were Miniſters (or at leaſt) Spectators of his miraculous Work.

(5.) Gen. 19. 24. *The Lord rained Fire from the Lord out of Heaven.* Why the *Lord* from the *Lord*; but becauſe it was *the Son* who rained this miraculous Fire from God *the Father*, or by order of God the Father? *Anſw.* But when the Apoſtle ſays, 2 *Tim.* 1. 18. *The Lord grant unto him, that he may find Mercy of the Lord in that day:* not only the moſt Learned of the Fathers, but all the Moderns, grant that no more but this is meant; the Lord grant him *His* Mercy, or Mercy *from himſelf.* 'Tis therefore an Hebraiſm, and *S. Caſtalio* has *learnedly* tranſlated the Words, *Pluit Jova a ſuipſo ignem de cœlo*, i. e. *The Lord rained Fire from himſelf out of Heaven.*

(6.) 2 Sam. 23. 2, 3. *The Spirit of God ſpake by me*; — *the God of* Iſrael *ſaid.* Here the Spirit ſeems to be called the *God of Iſrael. Anſw.* The Spirit being the Energy and Inſpiration of God, 'tis no wonder that the Pſalmiſt and Prophet here ſays, *The God of* Iſrael *ſaid.* The obvious ſenſe of the place, is this, God inſpired, and ſpake by me.

(7.) Pſal. 2. 7. *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* If the Lord Chriſt had no Exiſtence before he was born of bleſſed *Mary*, as the *Socinians* affirm; how could theſe Words be ſaid to him ſo many hundred years before? *Anſw.* Theſe Words in their original and primary ſenſe, are ſpoken of *David*; in their myſtical Senſe they are *a Prophecy* concerning Chriſt. And in this ſenſe St. *Paul* has taught us, that they were intended, not of the Lord Chriſt's (ſuppoſed) eternal Generation from the Eſſence of the Father, but of his being *begotten to Life again from the dead.* Acts. 13. 33. *God hath fulfilled*

fulfilled the ſame, — in that he raiſed up Jeſus from the dead; as it is written in the ſecond Pſalm, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* Col. 1. 18. *The Head of the Body the Church, the firſt-born from the dead.*

(8.) Pſal. 45. 6, 7. *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever; — thou haſt loved Righteouſneſs, — therefore thy God hath anointed thee with the Oil of Gladneſs above thy Fellows.* Theſe Words are interpreted of Chriſt by the Author to the Hebrews; *Heb.* 1. 8, 9. *Unto the Son he ſaith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever,* &c. *Anſw.* The Words are originally ſpoken of *Solomon*, as is confeſſed by *Rivet*, *Grotius*, and *Mercer*; and are by the Author to the *Hebrews* accommodated or applied to the Lord Chriſt. In a word, In their *litteral* Senſe they ſpeak of *Solomon*; in their *prophetical* or *myſtical* Senſe, of the Lord Chriſt. But neither *Solomon* nor Chriſt, is in either of theſe Texts, called *God*. Both the Hebrew and the Greek ſhould have been rendred, not, *Thy Throne* (*O God*) *is for ever*, but, *God is thy Throne* (*i. e.* thy Seat, Reſting-place, or Eſtabliſhment) *for ever.*

(9.) Pſal. 68. 18. *Thou haſt aſcended on high, thou haſt led Captivity captive, and haſt received Gifts for Men*; or, (as 'tis in the *Syriac*, and at *Eph.* 4. 8.) *haſt given Gifts to Men.* The Words in the *Pſalm* are manifeſtly ſpoken of God, and yet are interpreted of the Lord Chriſt by St. *Paul*; *Eph.* 4. 8, 9, 11. *Wherefore he ſaith, When he aſcended up on high, he led Captivity captive, and gave Gifts to Men.* (*Now that he aſcended, what is it, but that he alſo deſcended firſt into the lower parts of the Earth? He that deſcended, is the ſame alſo that aſcended up far above all Heavens, that he might fill all things.*) *And he gave ſome Apoſtles, ſome Prophets, and ſome Evangeliſts,* &c. *Anſw.* 1. Thoſe Words, *deſcended firſt into the lower parts of the Earth*; are to be underſtood of our Lord's deſcent into the Grave, from whence he aroſe, and afterwards aſcended into Heaven. 2. Theſe Words, *Aſcended far above all Heavens, that he might fill all things*, had been better rendred, that he might *fulfil all things*, namely *all the Prophecies* of himſelf and others concerning his Death, Deſcent into the Grave, and his Aſcenſion into the higheſt Heavens, far above all the viſible Heavens, all the Heavens and Orbs in which the Sun and Stars move. 3. *Thou haſt aſcended, and given Gifts to Men*; are in the Pſalm *litterally* meant of God, and of Chriſt *only by way of Prophecy*, or rather of Emblem and *Accommodation*. And that *Paul* in the *Epheſians* intended no more than an *Accommodation* (or, as *Grotius* ſpeaks, a myſtical or allegorical Interpretation) of the words in the *Pſalm*, is evident by the Gifts he mentions: *He gave ſome Apoſtles, ſome Prophets, ſome Evangeliſts*; that is, he advanced ſome to be Apoſtles, others to be Prophets and Evangeliſts, in the Chriſtian Church. Theſe Gifts not being given or received till about one thouſand Years after *David*'s time, *Paul* could not poſſibly intend *a litteral* Interpretation of *David's* Words, but only to *accommodate* them to Chriſt, becauſe Chriſt alſo did aſcend on high, and give Gifts to Men. To this effect ſpeak *Grotius*, Dr. *Patrick*, and other famous Interpreters on this Text.

Nothing is more uſual with the Writers of the New Teſtament, than to apply to the Lord Chriſt in a myſtical or allegorical Senſe, what had been ſaid by the Writers of the Old Teſtament of God, or any others, in the literal and primary Senſe of the Words. This they do as often as there is any likeneſs between the Perſons, or Things, or Events. For example, Thoſe Words of the Prophet, *Hoſea* 11. 1. *Out of* Egypt *I have called my Son*; though moſt plainly ſpoken of all *Iſrael*, are for the likeneſs of the Event accommodated unto, and ſaid to be fulfilled in the Lord Chriſt. Mat. 2. 15. *That it might be fulfilled which was ſpoken of the Lord by the Prophet, Out of* Egypt *I have called my Son.* Again, Thoſe Words at Pſal. 118. 22. *The Stone which the Builders refuſed, is become the Head Stone of the Corner*; are intended, all know and confeſs, in their primary and literal Senſe of *David*; who was rejected by King *Saul* and his Court, but

but was by God exalted to be King of *Iſrael*. But the ſame Words, for the likeneſs of the Event, are accommodated to Chriſt, or in a myſtical and allegorical Senſe interpreted of him; as *Mat.* 21. 42. and *Acts* 4. 11. Therefore as it were folly to dream that the Lord Chriſt is the People of *Iſrael*, or is King *David*, becauſe what is ſaid of *Iſrael* and of *David* in the Old Teſtament, is accommodated unto (or myſtically interpreted of) Chriſt: no more muſt we ſay, that he is God, becauſe thoſe things are after a myſtical and allegorical Way accommodated to him, which in the Old Teſtament were originally and literally ſpoken of God. He that ſhall read the Talmud, or other Rabbinical Writings, will ſee, that the Apoſtles took this way of interpreting from the Writers of their own Nation. For as often as the Jewiſh Rabbins met with any Event, or Thing, or Perſon, like to what is recorded in ſome place of the Old Teſtament; they ſaid, that Place was fulfilled, or was again fulfilled; and immediately accommodated the Words of ſuch Scripture to that Perſon, Event, or Thing.

(10.) Pſal. 95. 9, 10. *Your Fathers tempted me: forty Years long was I grieved with this Generation.* Theſe Words ſpoken *by* and *of* God, are interpreted of the Holy Ghoſt; Heb. 3. 7, 9, 10. *As ſaith the Holy Ghoſt, your Fathers tempted me*, &c. *Anſw. Eſtius, Piſcator, Capellus*, and *Grotius*, interpret thoſe Words, *As ſaith the Holy Ghoſt*, or Holy Spirit; not of ſuch Spirit as is a Perſon, but of the Afflatus or Inſpiration of God; ſo that the ſenſe of the words to the Hebrews is, *As ſaith the Holy Inſpiration of God, by the Mouth of the Prophet* David, *your Fathers tempted me.*

(11.) Pſal. 97. 7. *Worſhip him all ye Gods*, or all ye Angels. Theſe Words, though ſpoken of God, are interpreted of Chriſt: Heb. 1. 6. *Again, when he bringeth the Firſt-begotten into the World, he ſaith, And let all the Angels of God worſhip him. Anſw.* In the Greek 'tis, when he *bringeth again* the Firſt-gotten into the World (*i. e.* when he raiſed Chriſt from the dead, who is his Firſt-begotten from the dead) *He commandeth, let even all the Angels of God worſhip him.* 'Tis uncertain whether St. *Paul* had any reſpect to the Words in the *Pſalm*; but if he had, he doth not quote the words of the *Pſalmiſt* as if they were ſpoken of Chriſt, but only declareth the Decree of God (known to him by the Spirit) for ſubjecting the Angels to Chriſt, in the ſame Words that the *Pſalmiſt* had uſed on another occaſion; becauſe they are words moſt proper to expreſs that Decree, and the Writers of the New Teſtament generally affect to ſpeak in Scripture Language.

(12.) Pſal. 102. 25. *Of Old haſt thou laid the Foundation of the Earth*, &c. This ſeems applied to Chriſt, *Heb.* 1. 10, 11, 12, 13. *And thou, Lord, in the Beginning haſt laid the Foundation of the Earth.* —— *But to which of the Angels ſaid he at any time, Sit on my right Hand. Anſw. Tho. Aquinas* has rightly obſerved and acknowledged, that, *Thou, Lord, in the beginning haſt laid the Foundation of the Earth*; both in the *Pſalm*, and in the Context to the *Hebrews*, may be underſtood of God only, not of Chriſt. The Context of the Author to the *Hebrews*, hath this ſenſe, or may be thus interpreted; *And thou, Lord*, (that is, and in another Text of the *Pſalms* 'tis ſaid, *Thou, Lord:* So *Eſtius, Cameravius, Grotius*) *haſt laid the Foundation of the Earth.* —— *But to which of the Angels ſaid he*; (*i. e.* ſaid the Founder of the Earth, &c.) *ſit on my right Hand*; as he ſaith to Chriſt, *Pſal.* 110. 1? For though *Pſal.* 110. 1. is *literally* deſigned of *David*; yet you *Hebrews* knowing that *David* was in all things a Type of Chriſt, do alſo apply the words there, *Sit on my right Hand*, unto the Meſſias or Chriſt. Briefly, They ſay, this Senſe is moſt evident, if we read ver. 10. (or, *Thou, Lord, in the beginning haſt laid the Foundation of the Earth*) not to the foregoing Verſe in that Context to the *Hebrews*, but to the following Verſes, eſpecially to ver. 13.

(13.) Pſal. 110. 1. *The Lord ſaid unto my Lord, Sit on my right Hand, until I make thy Enemies*

nemies thy Footstool. It appears by *Mat.* 22. 43. That the Jews understood these Words as spoken of God and Christ by *David*; and thereupon our Saviour puts this Question to them, How Christ could be *David*'s Son, if *David* calls him his Lord? which can no way be answer'd but by saying, that he was *David*'s Son according to the Flesh, and *David*'s Lord, as he was God. *Answ.* Our Saviour's Words are, *David in Spirit* calleth him Lord, saying, *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit on my right Hand*; that is, David *in the Spirit of Prophecy* foreseeing Christ, calls him *his Lord*. But he calleth him so, not because Christ is God, (for then, *Himself could have made his Enemies his Footstool*) but because not only the Spirits of *David*, and of all *Saints*, but even Angels were to be made subject to Christ, as the reward of his most Holy Life, and obsequious and acceptable Death, 1 *Pet.* 3. 22. *Phil.* 2. 8, 9. But note, that when the *Psalmist* says, *The Lord said unto my Lord*; it is to be understood thus, *The Lord* hath in decree *said*, or he hath decreed it shall be so. See Dr. *Patrick*'s Paraphrase on this Text.

(14.) Psal. 110. 3. *Thy People shall be willing in the Day of thy Power; In the Beauty of Holiness from the Womb of the Morning, thou hast the Dew of thy Youth.* Who but Christ had his Birth, *in the Beauty of Holiness*, that is, from the Divine Essence: and *from the Womb of the Morning*; that is, from before all time, from the Womb of Eternity? *Answ.* The Translation hath little Sense, and the Interpretation of it less. Of so many Versions of this obscure Place, that of *S. Castalio*, makes the clearest Sense; He translates thus, *Thy People shall chearfully offer themselves; when with sacred Majesty thou goest to War, thou shalt have a numerous Youth, even as numerous as the Dew of the Morning's Womb.* Tot habebis, per quos hostes vincas, quam densus est ros matutinus. The Words are originally spoken of *David*; Mystically, they are a Prophecy of Christ, and the numerous Nations and People who shall profess his Name and Religion.

(15.) Psal. 139. 7. *Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?* But if the Spirit is Omnipresent, he is God. *Answ. From thy Spirit*, is an Hebrew Phrase for *from thee*. Like as when 'tis said of *Moses*, Psal. 106. 33. *They provoked his Spirit*; the undoubted meaning is, They provoked *him*. So also, Eph. 4. 30. *Grieve not the Spirit of God*, is an Hebraism for grieve not *God*.

(16.) Prov. 8. 23, 24. *I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the Earth was: When there were no Depths, I was brought forth.* *Solomon* is here speaking of Wisdom. What Wisdom? why the Son of God; for St. *Paul* witnesses, That Christ is *the Wisdom of God*, 1 Cor. 1. 24. *Answ. Solomon* in the objected Text, speaks of *the Quality or Faculty* of Wisdom, by which God so admirably disposed Matter or Bodies into that Frame which we call the World, and by which Men order their Affairs wisely. That he meaneth not as some have fancied, the Son, or the Spirit of God, appears by the Gender he useth. Ver. 2. *SHE standeth in the top of high Places:* Ver. 3. *SHE crieth at the Gates.* Chap. 7. ver. 4. *Say unto Wisdom, Thou art my Sister.* Can these things be said of the Son or Spirit? St. *Paul* to the *Corinthians* calls the Lord Christ, *the Wisdom of God*, and *the Power of God*, and *the Righteousness of God*, because God manifested his Wisdom, Power, and Holiness, in the Lord Christ; he made the Lord Christ his Minister and Instrument, in manifesting his Wisdom, Power, and Holiness. By him he wrought many Miracles and Wonders, for confirming the Christian Religion; by him he gave us a most perfect Rule of Life, recommended by immense Rewards and Penalties; and hereby declared the Infinity of his Power, his Holiness, and his Wisdom. And to this purpose do the more Learned, even of the *Trinitarians* themselves, interpret those Words of St. *Paul*.

(17.) Prov. 30. 4. *Who hath ascended up into Heaven,— who hath established all the ends of the Earth? what is his Name, and what is his Son's Name?* Therefore *Solomon* understood, that there was a Son of God. *Answ.* Those words,

What

What is his Name, and what is his Son's Name? ſhew, that the Speech here is not concerning God, or the Son of God. No *Jew* was ignorant, that *Jehovah* (or *Adonai*) is the Name of God, *Exod.* 6. 3. Therefore Dr. *Patrick* has (with his uſual Judgment) paraphraſed that Text thus: 'Who is he among all the 'Wiſe Men, that ever went up into Heaven 'and came down again, to tell us the Order 'and Motion of the Stars?—Who but God 'hath tyed up the Waves of the Sea, that 'they ſhould not exceed their Bounds? and 'who hath fixed the Earth? —*By what 'Name is he called, that can explain theſe things? 'or, if he be dead, what is the Name of his Son or 'his Family, that we may inquire of them?*

(18.) Iſa. 6. 1, 8, 9. *I ſaw the Lord ſitting upon a Throne.——I heard the Voice of the Lord;* ——*Go, tell this People, Hear ye indeed but underſtand not:—ſhut their Eyes.* This appearance of God to the Prophet, is by St. *John* aſcribed to Chriſt; John 12.41. *Theſe things ſaid* Iſaias, *when he ſaw his Glory.* And the Words, *Go, tell this People*, &c. are aſcribed to the Holy Spirit; Acts 28. 25, 26. *Well ſpake the Holy Ghoſt by* Iſaias,——*Go unto this People*, &c. By comparing theſe Places, 'tis eaſy to ſee that the whole Trinity appeared, and ſpake to the Prophet. *Anſw.* 1. The moſt Learned of the Orthodox Interpreters, both Fathers and Moderns, have confeſt, that the Words in St. *John* are to be underſtood, not of Chriſt, but of God; for God only is intended in the foregoing Verſe, to which the Words of this relate. 2. Accordingly, the beſt Greek Bibles read that Text thus, *Theſe things ſaid* Iſaias, *when he ſaw GOD's Glory, and ſpake of him.* 3. The Text in the *Acts* aſcribeth the words of the Prophet to the Holy Spirit; becauſe the Viſion, and all the words there mentioned were a Scene wrought in the Prophet's Mind (not exhibited to his outward Senſes) by the Spirit or Power of God.

(19.) Iſa. 7. 14. *A Virgin ſhall conceive and bear a Son, and ſhall call his Name* Immanuel. 'Tis added, Mat. 1.23. *Which being interpreted, is, God with us.* Therefore the Son of the Virgin was God. *Anſw.* 1. *Matthew* (as all know) wrote his Goſpel in *Hebrew*; and therefore did not interpret the *Hebrew* Name, no more than the Prophet (whoſe words he cited) had done before him. We are not bound to ſubſcribe to the Interpretation of the Greek Tranſlator, being an obſcure and unknown Perſon. The *Hebrew* Name is interpreted by *Eraſmus* (*Apol. ad Stunic.*) *God with him:* and to this Interpretation of this Name of our Lord Chriſt, St. *Peter* very plainly alludes, *Acts* 10.38. 2. Admitting that *Immanuel* (as we now *pronounce* the Word) may be interpreted *God with us*; yet the Child alſo who was to be a Sign to King *Ahaz* (and whom *Grotius* thinketh to be the Son of the Prophet *Iſaiah*) was called *Immanuel, by order from God.* And there are ſeveral Names of this high Import and Signification in Holy Scripture. *Elihu* (recorded 1 *Chron.* 12. 20.) is, *He is my God.* *Eliatha* (mentioned 1 *Chron.* 25.4.) ſignifies, *Thou art my God.* 3. Chriſt may be named *Immanuel*, taking it for *God with Us*; as God was moſt plentifully with his People, by ſending the Lord Chriſt to be his Ambaſſador and Repreſentative, and our Redeemer. Several of the moſt Learned *Trinitarians* acknowledg, that no more was intended in this Name. See *L. Brugenſ.* in *l.*

(20.) Iſa. 8.14. *He ſhall be a Stone of ſtumbling*, &c. This is ſpoken of God in the Prophet, and applied to Chriſt *Rom.* 9. 33. 1 *Pet.* 2.8. *Anſw.* Neither St. *Paul* nor St. *Peter* cite the Words of the Prophet, as ſpoken of Chriſt; but only as in ſome ſenſe applicable to him: namely as Chriſt alſo was to many a Stone of ſtumbling.

(21.) Iſa. 9. 6, 7. *Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given; He ſhall be called Wonderful, Counſellor, the mighty God, the everlaſting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the Increaſe of his Government and Peace, there ſhall be no end; upon the Throne of* David *to order it, and to eſtabliſh it with Judgment and Juſtice, from henceforth and for ever. The Zeal of the Lord of Hoſts ſhall perform this.* *Anſw.* 1. This cannot be a Prophecy of Chriſt; becauſe it ſpeaks of a Prince actually born at that time, *Unto us a Child IS born, unto us a Son IS given.* *Iſaiah* lived a-

bove 700 Years before Chriſt was born. And for this plain Reaſon, this Text is never applied to Chriſt by the Writers of the New Teſtament. 2. The Text is indeed to be underſtood of *Hezekiah*; but is very extravagantly rendred in the *Engliſh*. In the *Hebrew* 'tis thus, *Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given. The Wonderful Counſellor, the Mighty God ſhall name him the Peaceable Prince. His Government ſhall be multiplied* (i. e. He ſhall reign long, even Twenty Nine Years) *and he ſhall have very great Peace. He ſhall ſit upon the Throne of* David, *ordering and eſtabliſhing it with Judgment and Juſtice, from henceforth to the end of his Life. The Zeal of the Lord of Hoſts ſhall perform this*; i. e. God's Love to his choſen People ſhall make good this my Prophecy. Note, that *no end* of Peace, and *no end* of Riches, are never to be ſtrictly underſtood in Human Affairs; but we mean by them *very great* Peace and Riches. Therefore the Peace of *Hezekiah* being in Twenty Nine Years interrupted, by only one Expedition againſt him; and that alſo in the end unſucceſsful: He may be ſaid to have enjoyed great Peace, or (ſpeaking *Hyperbolically*, as is the manner of this Prophet) Peace without end.

(22.) Iſa. 35.4,5. *God will come,—then the Eyes of the blind ſhall be opened*, &c.. This ſeems to be applied to Chriſt, Mat. 11. 4, 5. *Jeſus anſwered,——Go, tell* John *what ye do ſee and hear, the Blind receive their Sight*, &c. *Anſw.* 1. It doth not appear that our Saviour intended to quote the words of the Prophet. 2. But admitting that he might allude to them; God is (in the Prophet) ſaid to come to the *Jews*, *in his Ambaſſador and Meſſenger Jeſus Chriſt*: and becauſe *in* and *by* him, he gave Sight to the Blind, *&c.* John 10. 14. *The Father that dwelleth IN me, he doeth the Works.* Acts 10. 38. *God was with him.*

(23.) Iſa. 40. 3. *The Voice of him that crieth in the Wilderneſs, Prepare ye the way of the Lord,——an high way for our God.* This Voice was *John* Baptiſt, *Mat.* 3.1,3. And it was Chriſt's way that he prepared, *Luke* 1.76. compared with *Mat.* 11. 10. *Mark* 1. 7. *Acts* 13. 24. *Anſw. John* Baptiſt is ſaid to prepare the way for God, when he prepared the way for Chriſt; becauſe Chriſt was the Ambaſſador and Repreſentative of God, and God was *with* and *in* Chriſt. Acts 10. 38. *God was WITH him.* John 14. 10. *The Father that dwelleth IN me, he doeth the Works.*

(24.) Iſa. 44. 6. *Thus ſaith the Lord, I am the Firſt, and I am the Laſt.* Chriſt alſo is called, *the Firſt and the Laſt*, Rev. 1. 8, 17. Rev. 22. 13. *Anſw. Rev.* 1. 8. is not ſpoken of Chriſt, but of God. At *ver.* 17. Chriſt is called *the Firſt and the Laſt*: but *Eraſmus*, *Grotius*, and *Hugo Cardinalis* interpret the Words of him *as he is a Man*. Chriſt, ſaith *Hugo*, is *the Firſt* (or, moſt Honourable) with good Men; and He is *the Laſt* (or, moſt Deſpiſed) with Infidels and wicked Men. Briefly, both Almighty God and our Lord Chriſt, are *the Firſt and the Laſt*, but in different Senſes.

(25.) Iſa. 45. 23. *I have ſworn by my ſelf,——Unto me every Knee ſhall bow.* Theſe words of God are applied to Chriſt, Rom. 14. 10, 11. *We ſhall all ſtand before the Judgment-Seat of Chriſt; for it is written,——every Knee ſhall bow to me, and every Tongue ſhall confeſs to God. Anſw.* In bowing and confeſſing to Chriſt at the laſt Judgment, we are ſaid to bow and confeſs to God; becauſe Chriſt *then* and *there* holdeth the Place of God, repreſenteth him, and acteth by his Commiſſion. So Men are ſaid to appear before our Soveraign Lord the King, when they appear at the Bar of his Judges; becauſe the Judges act in the King's ſtead, and by his Commiſſion.

(26.) Jer. 23. 5, 6. *I will raiſe unto* David *a righteous Branch*;——*in his Days* Judah *ſhall be ſaved, and* Iſrael *ſhall dwell ſafely*; *and this is the Name wherewith he ſhall be called, The Lord* (Heb. Jehovah) *our Righteouſneſs.* Chriſt, the Branch of *David*, is here called *Jehovah our Righteouſneſs. Jehovah* being the very Name of God, nay his *Incommunicable* Name; it follows that Chriſt is true God. *Anſw.* 1 *Grotius* has ſhown, that *the Branch* here intended is *Zorobabel*. 2. But theſe Words, *This is the Name wherewith he ſhall be called*, are ſpoken neither of *Zorobabel* nor of the Lord Chriſt, but of *Iſrael* (the Nation of *Iſrael*) immediately before men-

mentioned: as appears by this Parallel Text; Jer. 33. 15, 16. *In thoſe Days,——I will cauſe the Branch of Righteouſneſs to grow up unto* David, *and he ſhall execute Judgment and Righteouſneſs in the Land. In thoſe Days ſhall* Judah *be ſaved; and* Jeruſalem *ſhall dwell ſafely, and this is the Name wherewith SHE* (Jeruſalem) *ſhall be called, The Lord* (Heb. Jehovah) *our Righteouſneſs.* The meaning in both Texts is this; *Iſrael* and *Jeruſalem*, in the Days and under the Government of *Zorobabel*, ſhall be called *The Lord is our Righteouſneſs* (or, our Juſtifier) becauſe God ſhall forgive their paſt Sins, and accept and deal with them as a righteous People.

(27.) Dan. 3. 25. *The Form of the Fourth is like the Son of God. Anſw.* In the *Hebrew* 'tis like *a* Son of God; that is, like an Angel. For ſo this Paſſage is explained at *ver.* 28. And Angels are called Sons of God, *Job* 1. 6. *Job* 38. 7.

(28.) Micah 5. 2. *Thou* Bethlehem,——*out of thee ſhall come unto me, that is to be Ruler of* Iſrael; *whoſe goings forth have been of Old, from everlaſting*; or, as 'tis in the Margin, *from the Days of Eternity.* This Verſe is expounded of Chriſt, even by the Jewiſh Prieſts and Scribes, *Mat.* 2. 5, 6. *Anſw.* 1. In the *Hebrew* 'tis *from Ancient Days. Grotius* makes this Senſe of the Verſe, whoſe goings forth (or whoſe Deſcent, Original, or Pedigree) is of Old, from ancient Times. For Chriſt deſcendeth of the moſt Ancient Stock of *David*, of *Bethlehem.* Mr. *Calvin* makes the Senſe to be, whoſe goings forth have been *Decreed* from the Days of Eternity.

(29.) Zech. 2. 8, 9. *Thus ſaith the Lord of Hoſts; After the Glory hath he ſent me to the Nations which ſpoiled you,——I will ſhake my Hand upon them, and they ſhall be a ſpoil to their Servants; and ye ſhall know that the Lord of Hoſts hath ſent me.* He that here ſpeaks, calleth himſelf the Lord of Hoſts, *Thus ſaith the Lord of Hoſts:* yet he confeſſeth, that he is ſent by the Lord of Hoſts to deſtroy the Nations that had ſpoiled *Iſrael:* That is, God the Son was ſent by God the Father. This Text Cardinal *Bellarmin* calleth *Locum efficaciſſimum. Anſw.* Theſe Words, as they are in the *Latin* and *Engliſh* Tranſlations, are hardly Senſe. Neither are thoſe Words, *Thus ſaith the Lord of Hoſts*, the Words of the Lord of Hoſts himſelf; but of the Second Angel, who at Ver. 3, and 4. ſpoke to the firſt Angel, and to *Zechariah.* The Verſes ſhould have been thus rendred from the Hebrew, *Thus ſaith the Lord of Hoſts, Afterwards ſhall be Glory,* (*i. e.* after ye are departed out of *Babylon*, ver. 7. ye ſhall have Honour and Peace) *for he hath ſent me to the Nations which ſpoiled you:* (*i. e.* To the *Babylonians*, and their Confederates) *I will ſhake my Hand upon them, and they ſhall be a Spoil to their Servants*; (*i. e.* I will ſtir up their Subjects to rebel againſt them, and ſpoil them;) *And ye ſhall know that the Lord of Hoſts hath ſent me*; *i. e.* hath ſent me to puniſh them, and give you Peace and Glory.

(30.) *The Lord* (Heb. *Jehovah*) *ſaid unto Satan, The Lord* (Heb. *Jehovah*) *rebuke thee.* Here we can underſtand no other, but *Jehovah* the Father, and *Jehovah* the Son. *Anſw.* The Lord in the firſt Clauſe is the Angel of the Lord, as appears by ver. 1. for there Satan ſtands before the Angel. And that indeed he was an Angel, not true *Jehovah*, is aſcertained by his praying to another Perſon *to rebuke* (*i. e.* to chaſtiſe) *Satan.* In the Hypotheſis of the *Trinitarians*, the Son is no leſs Almighty than the Father, and therefore needed not to pray, that the Father ſhould chaſtiſe Satan. When Angels are ſent by God, and do repreſent his Perſon, the names *Jehovah* and *God* are communicated to them; Exod. 3. 2, 4, 6. *The Angel of the Lord appeared to him in a Flame of Fire out of the midſt of a Buſh. —— And when the Lord* (Heb. *Jehovah*) *ſaw that he turned aſide to ſee, God called to him out of the midſt of the Buſh: —— Moreover he ſaid, I am the God of thy Father.* Exod. 23. 20, 21. *Behold, I ſend my Angel before thee, —— to bring thee into the Place which I have prepared. —— Provoke him not, —— for my Name is in him.* Accordingly, in the following Chapters and Books of *Moſes*, this Angel is all along called God and *Jehovah.* Briefly, *Jehovah* is a Name of God, but ſuch an one as is ſometimes communicated both to Perſons and Places. Therefore in the vulgar Engliſh Tranſlation, that Text is

not

not well rendred; Psal. 83. 18. *Thou whose Name alone is* Jehovah, *art the most High over all the Earth.* In the Hebrew 'tis, *Thou whose Name is* Jehovah, *thou alone art the most High over all the Earth.* And so 'tis rendred in the English-Genevah Translation, which is a better and more dextrous Translation, especially in obscure or ambiguous Texts, than that which is *appointed to be read in Churches.* Those Translators better understood both the Hebrew and Greek than King *James* his Men did.

(31.) Zech. 12. 10. *They shall look upon me, whom they have pierced.* The Words are spoken of Almighty God, and yet are applied to the Lord Christ, *Rev.* 1. 7. and *John* 19. 37. *Answ.* As the Jews in the times of the Prophets, did (as it were) pierce God with their Sins of several kinds; so they pierced him again when they put to Death the Lord Christ: as on the contrary, He who *received* (*i. e.* kindly and respectfully entertained) the Lord Christ or his true Ministers, was understood as receiving God who sends them. But the Words in the Prophet, are not by St. *John interpreted* of Christ, but only *accommodated* or applied to Christ and his Sufferings.

(32.) Mal. 3. 1. *I will send my Messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord* (or, Prince) *whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his Temple.* This Messenger was *John* Baptist, who prepared the way before Christ. *Answ.* The Words may be accommodated to *John* Baptist and the Lord Christ, in such manner and sense as has been shewed on *Isaiah* 40. 3. but literally and primarily they were intended of *Nehemiah*, who was returning the second time to *Jerusalem.* Compare the two following Verses with *Nehemiah* 13. 6, 7, &c.

(33.) Baruch 3. 35, 37. *This is our God, ---afterwards did he shew himself upon the Earth, and conversed with Men.* This was fulfilled when God the Son took our Nature on him. *Answ.* 1. 'Tis an Apocryphal Book. 2. Those that admit the Book, reject these Verses as supposititious; because they doubt not, that these Words, *Afterwards did he shew himself upon the Earth, and conversed with Men,* were first only a Marginal Note added since the Birth and Death of our Lord, and in process of time taken into the Text of the Book. 3. The Original Greek may be thus rendred; ' Afterwards this Book of the ' Commandments of God, and the Law ' which endureth for ever, was seen upon ' Earth, and *turned over* by Men. Note, That the last Verse of *Baruch* 3*d*, is to be read with the first of *Baruch* the 4*th*.

Besides these particular Answers to the *several Texts* objected to their Doctrine out of the Old Testament, the *Socinians* say farther *to them all* in general.

1. Whereas so exceptionable a Doctrine as that of *the Trinity*, and its Dependances, ought to be proved by clear Texts and demonstrative Arguments; on the contrary, these Texts are (for the most part) so far from being clear and evident Proofs, that a Man must have a more than ordinary Wit and Capacity to apprehend how most of them are at all to the purpose, and why or to what end they are alledged by the *Trinitarians.* Most Men will want to be shewn the reason why they are cited or objected against the Unity of God.

2. Though in the Heat of Disputation and Anger, Men catch up any Weapon against their Adversaries; yet out of these Heats the more learned and judicious *Trinitarians* confess, That the Trinity and the Divinity of the Lord Christ and of the Holy Spirit, are not indeed taught in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, but are a Revelation made to us in the New. So saith *Tertullian, adv. Prax.* c. 3. St. *Cyprian*, Serm. 6. *Hierom, adv. Lucif. Theodorit, ad Græc.* l. 2. *R. Tuitiensis de Divin. Offic.* l. 11. c. 14. *F. L. Brugensis* on *John* 1. 49. and on *Mat.* 28. 19. *R. Bellarmine de Christ.* l. 2. c. 6. and more clearly *de Purgat.* l. 1. c. 11. and *de Amis. Grat.* l. 4. c. 15. *Calovius Anticrel. Sect.* 420. *A. Salmero Prol. in Evang.* 11. q. 3. Nay 'tis the more general Opinion of the Divines of all Sects and Perswasions.

3. If

3. If ſo many had not confeſſed it, yet the thing is evident in it ſelf. For if the Trinity were indeed taught in the Old Teſtament, how came the Jewiſh Church in all Ages to be ſo wholly ignorant of it, that (as all confeſs) they had not the leaſt Suſpicion, that God is more than one Perſon? And if in this they had been deceived, 'tis not to be doubted that our Saviour would have reproved their Hereſy, and carefully ſet them right, as he did *in the matter of the Reſurrection*, and of their *Traditions* or Oral Law pretended to be derived from *Moſes*; ſee what he ſaith, *Mat.* 15. 9. But doth our Lord any where charge them with Hereſy, for believing, that God is only one Perſon?

4. The *Socinians* are aware, that to Perſons who never read any thing of this great Queſtion, ſome of their Interpretations of the Texts, *both of the Old and New Teſtament*, may ſeem ſomewhat *harſh* and *ſtrained*. But this (they ſay) happens, only becauſe ſuch Perſons have been *always accuſtom'd* to underſtand the alledged Texts in a contrary ſenſe, in the ſenſe of the Church: but if they will *often read and conſider* the *Socinian* ſenſe of them, they will ſoon diſcern that 'tis not only a probable ſenſe, but the true and only Senſe of which theſe Texts are capable, if we would reconcile them to the reſt of Scripture, and (particularly) to the many and clear Texts and Demonſtrations cited and hinted in the Firſt Letter.

SIR,

I am Yours.

A Third Letter

Concerning the

UNITARIANS,

Called

SOCINIANS.

SIR,

IN this I give you the Texts of *the Evangelists and Acts* objected to the *Socinian* Doctrine concerning God our Lord Christ, and the Holy Spirit: and the Answers of the *Socinians* to the Arguments arising from them.

(1.) Matth. 1. 23. *They shall call his Name* Immanuel, *which being interpreted, is, God with us. Answ.* See on *Isa.* 7. 14.

(2.) Mat. 2. 2. *Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we —— are come to worship him. Answ.* Neither the *Hebrew, Greek*, nor *Latin* Word for *worship* him, import any more than a *civil* Worship and Honour. And it was the manner over all the *East*, and particularly among the *Jews*, to prostrate to Kings, 2 *Sam.* 19. 18. 1 *Kings* 1. 16, 23, 31. 2 *Sam.* 9. 6.

(3.) Mat. 9. 6. *The Son of Man hath Power on Earth to forgive Sins. Answ.* This is plainly spoken of Christ as he was a Man. God gave this Authority to the Lord Christ, because he gave to him also to know what was in Mens Hearts; namely, whether their Repentance and outward Professions were sincere and lasting. *John* 2. 24, 25. *Rev.* 1. 1.

(4.) Mat. 11. 27. *All things are delivered to me of my Father, and no Man knoweth the Son but the Father*, &c. *Answ.* (1.) If Christ were himself that *one true God*, it could not be said here that *another Person* gave all things into his Hands. (2.) The most Orthodox Interpreters do understand *all things* here, to be all things requisite for procuring and effecting the Redemption and Salvation of Men, or all things necessary to the executing the Office of the *Messias*. Whereas our Lord adds, *None knoweth the Son but the Father*, &c. *Maldonate* and *Grotius* make the sense to be, None but God knows *what the Son's Office is*, or what he is to do and suffer in order to the Salvation of Men; as on the other side, none but the Son knows *the*

the Father's Mind, concerning the way and means by which Mankind is to be redeemed and ſaved.

(5.) Mat. 12. 31. *Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt ſhall not be forgiven. Anſw.* St. *Auſtin*, and generally all judicious Interpreters, by Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt or Spirit, underſtand Mens aſcribing (with the Scribes and Phariſees in this Chapter) the Miracles and Works done apparently by the Spirit or Power of God, unto Magick, or the Power of the Devil. So that the Holy Ghoſt, or Spirit, is not in this Text a Perſon, or a God, but merely the Power of God.

(6.) Mat. 18. 20. *Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midſt of them.* Mat. 28. 20. *I am with you always, even to the end of the World.* Theſe Texts prove the Omnipreſence of Chriſt, and conſequently, that he is true God. *Anſw.* 1. St. *Paul* to the *Coloſſians* ſays, *Though I be abſent in the Fleſh, yet am I preſent with you in the Spirit, joying and beholding your Order and your Stedfaſtneſs*, Col. 2. 5. Was *Paul* Omnipreſent, or was he true God? He knew and ſaw *by the Spirit*, the good Order in the *Coloſſian* Church, and even the Stedfaſtneſs of their Faith; but the Lord much more knoweth and ſeeth his Churches by that Spirit which he hath *without meaſure*. 2. It may be ſaid, that the Lord Chriſt is *in the midſt of*, and is *with* his People; not as God is, by an immediate Preſence, but by his moſt powerful Aid and Help, which he affordeth, partly by his continual and ſucceſsful Mediation for them all in general, *Heb.* 7. 25. partly by the Angels who are under his Directions, and by him ingaged in the Defence of the Faithful, *Heb.* 1. 14.

(7.) Matth. 26. 63. *Tell us whether thou be the Chriſt, the Son of God.* Like to which Text are *Matth.* 14. 33. *Mat.* 16. 16. *John* 1. 49. *Anſw.* It being manifeſt that Princes are called Sons of God by the Pſalmiſt, *Pſal.* 82. 6. as alſo that *Pſal.* 2. 7. (*Thou art my Son*) is literally meant of *David*. Hence it was that the *Jews* both then and now call the *Meſſias the Son of God*; not becauſe (as ſome imagine) they think he is God, or is generated of the Divine Subſtance; but becauſe they expect he ſhall be a very great Prince, an univerſal Monarch, and therefore the Son of God in a more perfect and higher ſenſe than *David*, or other Princes are.

(8.) Mat. 28. 19. *Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt. Anſw.* (1.) To be baptized in the Name of a Perſon or Perſons, is a Rite by which one delivers himſelf to the Inſtitution, Inſtruction, and Obedience of ſuch Perſon or Perſons: ſo that to be baptized in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, is to profeſs to be led and guided by them; or (as *Grotius* expreſſes this matter) 'tis to declare we will admit of no other thing as a part of our Religion, but what proceeds from theſe, that is, nothing but what is *commanded* by God or the Father, and has been *delivered* by his Son the Lord Chriſt, and *confirmed* externally by the Miracles, and internally with the Witneſs and Teſtimony of the Spirit, that is, of the Power and Inſpiration of God. (2.) 'Tis in vain, not to ſay ridiculouſly pretended, that a Perſon or Thing is God, becauſe we are baptized *unto* it, or *in the Name of* it. For they *Moſes* and *John* Baptiſt alſo would be Gods, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, 2. *Our Fathers were — all baptized unto* Moſes. Acts 19. 3. *Unto what then were ye baptized? and they ſaid, Unto* John's *Baptiſm*; that is, (ſaith the Generality of Interpreters) *unto John* and the Doctrine by him delivered. Nor can it be doubted that to be *baptized unto* a Perſon or Perſons, and to be *baptized in the Name of* ſuch Perſon or Perſons, is the ſame thing. For, (1.) 'Tis acknowledged by all that underſtand the Hebrew and Syriac Idioms. (2.) 'Tis manifeſt by comparing ſome Texts of Scripture. For what in ſome of them is called *baptizing unto*, is in others called *baptizing in the Name of*. Rom. 6. 3. *As many of you as have been baptized into Jeſus Chriſt*, (or *unto* Jeſus Chriſt; for 'tis the ſame Prepoſition in the Greek that is uſed of *Moſes*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, 2. and of

John Baptiſt, *Acts* 19. 3.) *have been baptized into* (or *unto*) *his Death.* Gal. 3. 27. *As many of you as have been baptized into Chriſt* (in the Greek, *unto* Chriſt) *have put on Chriſt.* Acts 2. 38. *Be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt.* Acts 8. 16. *They were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jeſus.* Who does not now ſee, that to be baptized *unto*, and *in the Name of* Chriſt, or any other Perſon or Thing, are uſed as equivalent terms? And accordingly the Fathers, particularly *Tertullian*, often ſay baptized *unto* the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. Nothing therefore can be inferred from this Text, for the Godhead of the Son or Spirit; becauſe as now Chriſtians are baptized unto them, ſo the Jews were baptized unto *Moſes*, and *John*'s Diſciples unto *John*.

(9.) Luke 1. 16, 17, 76. *Many of the Children of* Iſrael *ſhall he* (John Baptiſt) *turn to the Lord their God; and he ſhall go before him in the Spirit and Power of* Elias. —— *Thou Child ſhalt be called the Prophet of the Higheſt, for thou ſhalt go before the Face of the Lord to prepare his way. Anſw.* See on *Iſa.* 40. 3.

(10.) Luke 17. 5. *The Apoſtles ſaid unto the Lord, Increaſe our Faith. Anſw.* By thy Prayers to God, which are always heard for us.

(11.) Luke 24. 47. *That Repentance and Remiſſion of Sin ſhould be preached in his* (Chriſt) *Name. Anſw.* The ſenſe is, Chriſt commanded the Diſciples to require Men to repent, and on their ſo doing, to aſſure them in his Name (or from him) that God would forgive them.

(12.) John 1. 1, &c. *In the Beginning was the Word*, &c. *Anſw.* The Trinitarian Expoſition of this Chapter is abſurd, and contradictory: 'tis this,

In the Beginning: i. e. from all Eternity. *Anſw.* From all Eternity is *before* the Beginning, or *without* Beginning; not *in* the Beginning. *In the Beginning* muſt refer to ſome time and thing, it muſt be in the Beginning of the World, or of the Goſpel, or of the Word: and in which ever of theſe ſenſes it is taken, *the Word* cannot be from all Eternity, by Virtue or Force (I mean) of this Expreſſion.

Was the Word, i. e. was God the Son. *Anſw.* But where in Scripture is *the Word* called *God the Son?*

The Word was with God; i. e. The Son was with the Father. *Anſw.* It ſeems then that *God* in this Clauſe is *the Father*. But was not the Son alſo with the Holy Ghoſt, and is not he too (according to the *Trinitarians*) God, or a God? If he is, why doth St. *John* only ſay *the Son was with the Father*; and how comes the Father to engroſs here the Title of *God* to the Excluſion of the Holy Ghoſt?

The Word was God. What ſhall we do here? Was *the Word* the Father? for ſo they interpreted *God* in the foregoing Clauſe. No, *God* in this Clauſe, hath *a new meaning*, 'tis *God the Son*. But in the whole Scripture there are not theſe Words, *God the Son*.

The ſame was in the Beginning with God. How comes this to be again repeated? for *John* had ſaid once before, that the Word was with God. They care not, 'tis ſaid, and that's enough. The Truth is, according to their Senſe of this Context, no account can be given of this Repetition, and they muſt allow it to be a meer Tautology. But let us (ſay the *Socinians*) hear *Grotius* interpreting this ſublime Proem of St. *John*'s Goſpel.

Ver. 1. *In the Beginning*, (i. e. when God created the Heavens and the Earth. For theſe Words are taken from *Gen.* 1. 1.) *was the Word.* The *Hebrews* call that *Power and Wiſdom* of God, by which he made the World, and does all other his extraordinary Works, *his Word.* Pſal. 33. 6. *By the Word of the Lord were the Heavens made.* Heb. 11. 2. *The Worlds were made by the Word of God.* 2 Pet. 3. 5. *By the Word of God the Heavens were of old.* Pſal. 107. 20. *He ſent his Word, and healed them.* They borrowed this Expreſſion from *Moſes*, who in deſcribing the Creation, ſaith that *God ſaid, Let there be Light*, Gen. 1. 3. *God ſaid, Let there be a Firmament*, Gen. 1. 6. and ſo through the whole Chapter. Undoubtedly *Moſes* is not to be underſtood of a Word orally ſpoken, for God is a Spirit; but his meaning

is,

is, God put forth his *Power and Wiſdom*, and thereby created Light and the Firmament, *&c.* as eaſily as Men can ſpeak theſe Words, *Let there be Light*, *Let there be a Firmament*. Thus we ſee why the Divine Wiſdom and Power was called *the Word* by *David*, and ſo many Writers of the New Teſtament.

The Word was with God; i.e. It was not yet in the World, or not yet made Fleſh, (*ver.* 10, and 14.) but with God.

The Word was God; i. e. The Word (or Divine Wiſdom and Power) is not ſomething different from God; but being his Wiſdom and Power, is God. 'Tis the common Maxim of Divines, that the Attributes and Properties of God are God. Which is in ſome Senſe true. We may alſo here note, that thoſe Perſons (whether Angels or Men) to whom the *Divine Word* hath been in an extraordinary Degree communicated, have alſo had the Names *Jehovah* and God given to them. The Angel who deſtroyed *Sodom* by *a miraculous Tempeſt* from Heaven, is called *Jehovah*; ſo is he that promiſed *Abraham* to cauſe *Sarah* to conceive a Son, *Gen.* 18. 13. On the ſame account God ſays to *Moſes*, Exod. 7. 1. *See I have made thee a God to* Pharaoh. Ver. 2. *The ſame was in the Beginning with God.* This is here again repeated by the Evangeliſt, to teach us that *the Word* is ſo God, that it is not all that God is; there being other Properties and Attributes of God, that are communicable as well as the *Word*.

Ver. 3. *All things were made by him.* The *Engliſh-Geneva* Tranſlation ſaith here, All things were made by *It*. But it matters not, for *the Word* begins here to be ſpoken of as a Perſon, by the ſame *Figure of Speech* that *Solomon* ſaith, Wiſdom *hath builded* her Houſe, and *hewn out* her ſeven Pillars, *Prov.* 9. 1. And that *David* calls God's Commandments *Counſellors*, Pſal. 119. 24.

Ver. 4. *In him*; i. e. In him when he was in the World and was made Fleſh; *Ver.* 10, and 14.

Was Life; i.e. By the Word, when made Fleſh or *Man*, the way and manner of obtaining Life (eternal Life) was diſcovered to the *Gentiles*. The way is the Doctrine of the Goſpel, *John* 12. 50.

And the Life was the Light of Men; i. e. The Life-giving Doctrine by him taught, was that Light, to and by which Men may and ought to direct their Steps in order to eternal Bleſſedneſs. *John* 12. 50. So here the Doctrine of Chriſt, the Goſpel, is called Light, as before it was called Life.

Ver. 8. *He* (John) *was not that Light*; i. e. *John* neither was, nor was the bringer of the Light of the Goſpel: though he bare Witneſs to both. 'Tis uſual in familiar Speech to call the Bringer of a thing, by the Name of the thing he brings: and for this reaſon our Saviour is called Life, and Light, *John* 14. 6. *John* 8. 12.

Ver. 10. *He was in the World.* Here the Evangeliſt returns to ſpeak of *the Word*. The Senſe is, in Proceſs of time the Word became incarnate, that is, *Abode on the Perſon of Jeſus Chriſt*, and ſo converſed in the World among Men. God communicated his Word, (that is, a vaſt Effuſion of his Divine Power and Wiſdom) to his Son the Lord Chriſt, *Acts* 10. 38.

The World was made by him; i.e. The World and all Men were made by this Word, which (afterwards) abode on Jeſus Chriſt: and which *in* and *by* him performed Works not much leſs wonderful than was the firſt Creation.

And the World knew him not. Knew not that the Word abiding on Jeſus, was that very Divine Word which made both the World and all Men.

Ver. 11. *He came unto his own*; i.e. To thoſe whom he had made, *ver.* 10. *He* is to be underſtood of the Word. The Word came in the Perſon of Chriſt.

His own received him not; i. e. did not own him for what he indeed was, the Divine Word. 'Tis again repeated, to brand the Ingratitude and Stupidity of the *Jews* of that Age.

Ver. 12. *Them that believe on his Name.* On his Name, is an Hebrew Phraſe, as much as to ſay, *on him*; i. e. Them that believed on the Word, made Fleſh: or them that receiv-

ved and owned him for what he indeed was, even the Divine Word.

Ver. 14. *And the Word was made Fleſh*; Or, *For* the Word was made Fleſh: *i.e.* did abide on and inhabit an Humane Perſon, the Perſon of Jeſus Chriſt; and ſo was (in appearance) made Fleſh or *Man:* for Fleſh is the uſual Scripture Phraſe for Man, *Gen.* 6. 12. *Deut.* 5. 26. *Jer.* 12. 12. *Jer.* 17. 5. *Mark* 13. 20.

And we beheld his Glory; i. e. The Glory of the Man, on whom *the Word* did abide and inhabit in him. We beheld his Glory in his many Miracles, *John* 2. 11. Alſo in his Tranſfiguration, 2 *Pet.* 1. 17. And on many other occaſions.

The Glory as of the only-begotten of the Father; i. e. A Glory worthy of the only-begotten of the Father. Chriſt is called the only-begotten on ſeveral accounts, this eſpecially, that he only was begotten by the Divine Power on a Woman, *Luke* 1. 35.

Ver. 15. John *bare Witneſs of him*—*ſaying*, —*He was before me:* i. e. Was before me in Dignity, being the only-begotten of God. So *Eraſmus* and *Beza* as well as *Grotius*.

Ver. 18. *Which is in the Boſom of the Father*; i. e. Who is moſt dear to the Father. So the Phraſe ſignifies in other Texts; *Numb.* 11. 12. *Deut.* 13. 6.

Hath declared him; i. e. Hath revealed his Mind and Will to Men. Hitherto (for the moſt part) *Grotius*.

Briefly, *The Word* (according to *Grotius*) is not an eternal Son of God, but is here the Power and Wiſdom of God; which Word abiding without meaſure on the Lord Chriſt; (as it is expreſly ſaid, *Heb.* 1. 3. *Mat.* 28. 18. *Col.* 2. 3. ſee the Notes on theſe Texts) 'tis therefore ſpoken of as a Perſon, and as one Perſon with Chriſt, and he with that.

This Notion of *the Word* will lead a Man through all the Difficulties of this Chapter, with far more eaſe than any other hitherto offered. Beſides that it is ſo well founded, as has been ſhown on *ver.* 1. 'tis alſo as eaſy and obvious, and clears the Senſe as much as can be expected on a Portion of Scripture that is ſo obſcure and dark, and which was deſignedly written after a myſterious and ſublime manner.

(13.) John 2. 19, 21. *Deſtroy this Temple, and in three Days I will raiſe it up.*—*He ſpake of the Temple of his Body. Anſw.* Chriſt raiſed his Body, by a Power communicated to Him by the Father: and accordingly his being raiſed, is always attributed to the Father, not to himſelf. *Gal.* 1. 1. Paul *an Apoſtle*,—*by Jeſus Chriſt*; *and God, the Father, who raiſed him from the Dead.* See alſo *Eph.* 1. 19, 20. 1 *Theſſ.* 1. 9, 10. Had our Lord raiſed himſelf by his own proper Power, his Reſurrection could in no reſpect be aſcribed to the Father.

(14.) John 2. 25. *He knew what was in Man. Anſw.* The Knowledg which the Lord Chriſt had, or now in his ſtate of Exaltation hath, of the Secrets of Mens Hearts, is the pure Gift of, and Revelation from God, and the Divine *Word* abiding on him. Rev. 1. 1. *The Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, which God gave to him, to ſhew unto his Servants.* John 3. 34. *God giveth not the Spirit by meaſure* (that is, ſparingly) *unto him.* But ſee alſo what they ſay on *Rev.* 2. 23.

(15.) John 3. 13. *No Man hath aſcended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven*; *even the Son of Man, which is in Heaven. Anſw.* (1.) *Eraſmus, Beza, Camerarius*, acknowledg that the Greek ſhould be rendred, which *was* in Heaven. Neither ſo are the Words, *which was in Heaven*, an idle Repetition of what went before; for it is repeated *majoris aſſeverationis cauſâ*, for its greater Confirmation. The moſt learned Orthodox Interpreters underſtand this aſcending into, and being in Heaven, as alſo the deſcending, only *metaphorically*; and interpret thus, *No Man hath aſcended up to Heaven:* No Man hath known the Mind of God our Heavenly Father: *But he that came down from Heaven*; *i. e.* but he that is ſent to you as the Meſſenger of Heaven, or of God. *Even the Son of Man which is in Heaven*; *i. e.* even I whoſe Meditation and Converſation is in Heaven. As St. *Paul* ſays of himſelf, *Phil.* 3. 20. *Our Converſation is in Heaven.* So they interpret the whole Paſſage, of the humane Nature, I ſuppoſe,

ſuppoſe, becauſe our Lord conſiders and ſpeaks of himſelf here by the Name only of *the Son of Man*. But the *Socinians* do (generally) underſtand this Text literally, and ſay, that 'tis here intimated that before our Lord entred upon his Office of *Meſſias*, he was taken up to Heaven to be inſtructed in the Mind and Will of God (as *Moſes* was into the Mount, *Exod.* 24. 1, 2, 12.) and from thence deſcended to execute his Office, and declare the ſaid Will of God. The ſame thing they ſay is alſo hinted, *John* 6. 38, 46, 51, 62. *John* 8. 40.

(16.) John 3. 18. *The only begotten.* *Anſw.* See on *John* 1. 14.

(17.) John 5. 19. *Whatſoever things He* (the Father) *doth, thoſe alſo doth the Son.* *Anſw.* The Son doth them, only by the Spirit or Power of the Father inhabiting in him. John 5. 30. *I can do nothing of my ſelf.* John 14. 10. *The Father that dwelleth in me, He doth the Works.* Matth. 12. 28. *I caſt out Devils by the Spirit of God.*

(18.) John 5. 23. *That all Men ſhould honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.* *Anſw.* The meaning only is, as we honour God or the Father, ſo we muſt not forget to honour alſo the Son of God; becauſe to him the Father hath committed the laſt Judgment of all Men, ver. 22. An Equality of Honour is no more intended here, than an Equality of Perfection in thoſe words, *Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect*, Matth. 5. 48. For the ſenſe there is, As God is truly perfect, ſo do ye endeavour to be perfect with that Perfection of which your finite Natures are capable.

(19.) John 6. 44. *I will raiſe him up at the laſt Day.* *Anſw.* The Lord Chriſt ſhall raiſe and change our Bodies by the ſame Divine *Word*, or Power of God communicated to him, and abiding on him, by which while he was in this mortal Life, he raiſed and changed the Body of *Lazarus*, which was corrupted: that the Power by which he reſtored *Lazarus* to Life again, was not our Lord's own proper Power, but God's, that is, the Father's; is plainly intimated by our Lord himſelf, *John* 11. 41. *Father, I thank thee that thou haſt heard me*, &c. Almighty God can lodge, even in dry Bones, a Power of reſtoring the Dead, 2 *Kings* 13. 21. See alſo what hath been ſaid on *John* 5. 19.

(20.) *John* 8. 56, 58. Abraham *rejoyced* (or deſired) *to ſee my Day, and ſaw it.* — *Before* Abraham *was, I am*, or (as 'tis rendred by the Syriac, *Nonnus* and *Grotius*) *I was.* *Anſw.* (1.) *Abraham* ſaw Chriſt's Day, in the Spirit of Prophecy; he ſaw it as coming, not as preſent; he foreſaw (as he deſired) the time when it ſhould be. (2.) St. *Auſtin* has confeſſed, that Chriſt is here ſaid to be before *Abraham*, not actually, but in the Counſel, Decree and Ordination of God. And ſo St. *Peter* explains this matter; 1 Pet. 1. 20. *Who verily was fore-ordained from the Foundation of the World, but was made manifeſt in theſe laſt times.* In like manner at *Rev.* 13. 8. Chriſt is called *the Lamb ſlain from the Foundation of the World.* The Words are, *Whoſe Names are not written in the Book of Life, of the Lamb ſlain from the Foundation of the World.* Every one ſees that Chriſt could be no otherways ſlain *from* the Foundation of the World, but in the Counſel and Decree of God. See more ſuch Inſtances on *John* 17. 5. 'Tis true the *Jews* did not apprehend in what ſenſe our Lord meant he was before *Abraham*: but neither did he intend or care they ſhould; for finding them averſe from Truth and Piety, he often ſo ſpake to ſome of them, as to perplex and affront their Blindneſs and Arrogance yet more, and not to inſtruct them: ſee for this *Luke* 8. 10.

(21.) John 10. 30. *I and the Father are one.* *Anſw.* Not one God, but as Friends are ſaid to be one. Thus our Lord explains himſelf, *John* 17. 11. *Keep them whom thou haſt given me, that they may be one, as we are.* The Diſciples could be one no otherways than as Friends are one, (namely *in Affection and Deſign*) neither with one another, nor with God. Ver. 22. *The Glory which thou gaveſt me*, (*i. e.* the Power of doing Miracles) *I*

have

have given them, that they may be one, as we are one.

(22.) John 10. 33. *Thou being a Man makeſt thy ſelf God*, or *a* God. *Anſw.* It appears they lied, by our Saviour's Anſwer at ver. 36. *Say ye of him, whom the Father hath ſanctified, and ſent into the World, Thou blaſphemeſt; becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God?* Had our Lord been more than the Son of God, he would have owned his Dignity, when they charged him with Blaſphemy for ſaying thoſe things, from which it might (by their ſtrained Conſequences) be inferred that he made himſelf a God. *Camero* on this Text ingenuouſly confeſſes, that *in this Context* our Lord doth not make himſelf God: He adds, That Times and Circumſtances required, that the Revelation of this Myſtery ſhould be deferred till our Lord's Reſurrection and Aſcenſion into Heaven. In which ſaying, he gives up to the *Socinians* all the Texts of the Evangeliſts.

(23.) John 10. 38. *The Father is in me, and I in him. Anſw.* 'Tis alſo ſaid, 1 *John* 4. 16. *He that dwelleth in Love*, (*i. e.* exerciſeth Love and Charity) *dwelleth in God, and God in him.* Therefore Chriſt and Chriſtians are ſaid to be in God, and God in them, by their mutual Love; or becauſe of their mutual Love. See 1 *John* 2. 24. and 3. 24. and 4. 15.

(24.) John 12. 41. *Theſe things ſaid* Iſaias, *when he ſaw his Glory, and ſpake of him. Anſw.* See on *Iſai.* 6. 1, 8, 9.

(25.) John 14. 1. *Ye believe in God, believe alſo in me. Anſw.* Our Lord has himſelf interpreted this. John 12. 44. *He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that ſent me.*

(26.) John 14. 7, 9. *If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father alſo: and from henceforth ye know him, and have ſeen him. ——He that hath ſeen me, hath ſeen the Father; how ſayeſt thou then, Shew us the Father? Anſw.* It is alſo ſaid, *Luke* 10. 16. *He that heareth you, heareth me*; 'tis there farther added, *He that deſpiſeth you, deſpiſeth me; and he that deſpiſeth me, deſpiſeth him that ſent me.* Shall we now infer, that the Diſciples and Miniſters of Chriſt, are Chriſt: nay, are him alſo that ſent Chriſt, namely God? The Truth therefore is, when we are ſaid to know, ſee, hear, deſpiſe God, in knowing, ſeeing, hearing, or deſpiſing Chriſt, or his Miniſters; the meaning only is, that Chriſt and his true Miniſters being the Ambaſſadors and Meſſengers of God, and revealing to us his Nature and Will, they are ſo far forth to be eſteemed one with God; and in ſeeing and hearing them, we ſee and hear him as much as the inviſible God can be ſeen or heard, in this mortal Life.

(27.) John 14. 14. *If ye aſk any thing in my Name, I will do it. Anſw.* The obvious meaning is, if ye pray for any thing to God, uſing my Name; I will cauſe it to be done for you by my Interceſſion, the general Interceſſion that I will make for all good Chriſtians. Heb. 7. 25. *He is able to ſave them that come unto God by him*, (*i. e.* that pray to God in his Name) ſeeing he ever liveth to make Interceſſion for them.

(28.) John 16. 8, 13, 14. *When he* (the Comforter, or Spirit) *is come, he will reprove the World of Sin: —— He ſhall not ſpeak of himſelf: —— He ſhall receive of mine, and ſhew it to you.* Here the Spirit is plainly ſpoken of as a Perſon. *Anſw.* (1.) Of thoſe that are *Unitarians*, all the *Arians*, and very many *Socinians*, do acknowledg, that the Holy Spirit is a Perſon, chief of the Heavenly Spirits, prime Miniſter of God and Chriſt; becauſe he is here called the Comforter (or Advocate) and ſaid to hear, ſpeak, and teach; and elſewhere to interceed for us. But they add, that this very Context in telling us, (ver. 13.) *He will guide you into all Truth, for he ſhall not ſpeak of himſelf*; ſufficiently ſheweth that he is not God, or a God. For it were intolerable to ſay of God, he ſhall lead you into all Truth, for he ſhall not ſpeak of himſelf: the contrary is true of God, he ſhall lead you into all Truth, *For he ſhall ſpeak of himſelf.* (2.) But more generally the *Socinians* ſay, that Actions proper to Perſons are by a Figure aſcribed *to things*, and even *to*

Qualities of things, not only in Holy Scripture, but in all Writers. God's Commandments are called *Counſellours*, Pſal. 119. 24. Underſtanding is ſaid *to lift up her Voice*, Prov. 8. 1. Wiſdom *to build* her Houſe, and *hew out* her ſeven Pillars, *Prov.* 9. 1. ſee *Heb.* 4. 12, 13. *Luke* 4. 39. Charity *to think* no evil, 1 *Cor.* 13. 5. Water and Blood *to bear Witneſs*, 1 John 5. 8. The Stone ſet up by *Joſhua*, *to bear* all the Words of the Lord, *Joſh.* 24. 27. Are theſe things Perſons? Is it not evident that Actions proper to Perſons are aſcribed to them, as well as to the Holy Spirit, or Power and Inſpiration of God, by the Figure called *Proſopopœia?* Briefly, We ought to conceive thus of this matter, a great Effuſion of God's Inſpiration and Power being to be given to the Diſciples, that it might be a continual Director and Guide when the Lord Chriſt was no more perſonally with them: therefore this Guide is by the aforeſaid Figure ſpoken of in ſuch terms as if it were ſome Doctor, Teacher, and Advocate. Hence it is ſaid to reprove the World, to guide into all Truth, to intercede for us, (namely, becauſe it ſuggeſteth Prayer and Affection in Prayer:) alſo not to ſpeak of himſelf, but to ſpeak what he ſhall hear from God; to receive of Chriſt's, that is, receive of God the Remainder of Chriſt's Doctrine, and teach it to the Apoſtles. For 'tis to be noted that our Lord left ſome things to be taught by this Inſpiration of God; becauſe the Diſciples were not capable to hear and believe them, till they had ſeen the great Miracles of our Lord's Reſurrection and Aſcenſion into Heaven, *John* 16. 12. *I have yet many things to ſay to you, but ye cannot bear them now; Howbeit when the Spirit of Truth is come, he ſhall guide you into all Truth.* The Spirit that guided the Apoſtles into all Truth, was it not the meer Inſpiration of God?

It is for the ſame Reaſon, and by the ſame Figure, that this Power and Inſpiration of God in the Apoſtles, is ſaid *to bear Witneſs*, *John* 15. 26. to ſearch Myſteries, 1 *Cor.* 2. 10, 11. to diſtribute Gifts, 1 *Cor.* 12. 2. to appoint Biſhops, *Acts* 20. 28. to glorify Chriſt, *John* 16. 14.

Finally, It appeared in the Form of a Dove on Chriſt, and of Cloven Tongues on the Apoſtles, *Matth.* 3. 16. *Acts* 2. 3, 4. Becauſe God conveyed this Divine Energy to the Lord Chriſt, and to the Apoſtles, in theſe outward Symbols, which were fit Emblems of the Quality of the Gifts then beſtowed. The Dove ſignified the mild and peaceable Spirit of Chriſt; and that the Power then conveyed to him ſhould not be for the Damage or Hurt of Mankind: The Tongues denoted, that the Apoſtles did then and there receive the Gift or Faculty of ſpeaking with many Tongues. But what ſenſe can the *Trinitarians* make of theſe things? They ſay the Spirit is a Perſon and God: Did God receive and aſſume the Shape of a Dove, that is, of a Brute? What hinders but that they may believe all the Transformations in the Metamorphoſis of *Ovid?*

(29.) John 16. 15. *All things that the Father hath, are mine. Anſw.* 1. St. *Paul* hath ſaid as much of every Chriſtian; 1 Cor. 3. 21, 22. *All things are Yours:——things preſent, things to come, all are Yours.* 2. *All things* in this Text of St. *John*, are all things relating to the Chriſtian Faith, Doctrine and Diſcipline: for it follows, *Therefore ſaid I, He* (the Spirit) *ſhall take of mine, and ſhew it to you.* The meaning of the whole Paſſage is, all things relating to the Doctrine and Diſcipline of the Chriſtian Church, *which the Father hath in his Mind and Deſign, are mine:* that is, are known to me, and ſhall (for the moſt part of them) be ordered by my ſelf: as for the reſt which I my ſelf do not diſcover or order, the Spirit ſhall receive it, and ſhew it to you.

(30.) John 17. 5. *Glorify me with thine own ſelf, with the Glory I had with thee, before the World was. Anſw.* 1. St. *Auſtin* and many other learned and Orthodox Interpreters, not only grant, but contend that the meaning here is, Let me now *actually* receive that Glory with thy ſelf, which I had with thee *in thy Decree and Deſign* before the World was. This Interpretation is confirmed by this, that the Sufferings of Chriſt were to precede his *actual* Glory;

Glory, 1 Pet. 1. 11. *Searching what, and what manner of time the Spirit —did ſignify, when it teſtified before-hand the Sufferings of Chriſt, and the Glory that ſhould follow.* 2. As 'tis here ſaid, *The Glory that I had with thee before the World was:* ſo 'tis ſaid, 2 Cor. 5. 1. *We have a Building of God, an Houſe not made with Hands.* Where *we have*, is, we have it in God's Decree and Intention, or it is prepared for us. 2 Tim. 1. 9. *Grace was given us in Chriſt before the World was.* Where again, *was given to us*, is, was given in God's Decree and Intention. Therefore ſo alſo we may underſtand, that Chriſt had Glory before the World was.

(31.) John 17. 10. *All mine are thine, and thine are mine. Anſw.* It appears by the foregoing Verſe, and by what follows, that Chriſt ſpeaks of ſuch as were or ſhould be his Diſciples. His meaning is, all that are my Diſciples, are of thy giving to me, and ſtill remain thine; and all that are true Servants and Lovers of God, readily become mine, that is, Diſciples to me.

(32.) John 17. 24. *For thou lovedſt me from the Foundation of the World. Anſw.* None can deny that God loved all the Elect from the Foundation of the World. To God all things are preſent; not only what is paſt, but what is to come, is preſent to the Divine Mind and Knowledg.

(33.) John 20. 28. Thomas *anſwered, and ſaid unto him, My Lord, and my God:* Or, O my Lord, and O my God! For 'tis an Attic Vocative. *Anſw.* 1. *Neſtorius*, Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, was of Opinion that theſe Words were not deſigned to Chriſt, but to God. For though the Evangeliſt ſaith, Thomas *anſwered and ſaid unto him* (i. e. to Chriſt) *O my Lord, and O my God*; yet the Exclamation might be addreſſed to God as its Object, tho it was alſo *an* Anſwer to our Saviour, or *in* Anſwer to our Saviour, and to what he had ſaid at *ver.* 27. Or, if the Words were addreſſed to our Saviour alſo, it may be admitted as true what others ſay here: Namely, 2. When *Thomas* had felt the Prints of the Spear and Nails in our Saviour's Side and Hands, and was thereby fully ſatisfied that he was indeed riſen again, he breaks forth into this Exclamation; the firſt part of which he directed to Chriſt, the other to God. *O my Lord!* are Words of Congratulation to our Saviour; *And O my God!* Words of Admiration and Praiſe to God.

(34.) Acts 5. 3. 4. *Why hath Satan filled thine Heart, to lie to the Holy Ghoſt? — Thou haſt not lied unto Men, but unto God. Anſw.* Some of the moſt celebrated Interpreters among the *Trinitarians* have owned, that this Text ought to be thus underſtood, *Why haſt thou lied to the Holy Ghoſt*; i.e. to us Apoſtles who have (thou knoweſt) the Holy Spirit or Inſpiration of God in us. *Thou haſt not lied unto Men, but unto God*; i. e. thou haſt not hereby lied to Men only or chiefly, but to God, who is in us by his Spirit and Inſpiration. This Interpretation is confirmed by 1 Theſſ. 4. 8. *He therefore that deſpiſeth, deſpiſeth not Man, but God, who hath alſo given unto us his Holy Spirit.* Here 'tis manifeſt, that thoſe who deſpiſed the Apoſtles, are ſaid to deſpiſe God, becauſe God was in them by his Spirit: What hinders then, but that for the ſame reaſon, thoſe that lied to the Apoſtles, ſhould be ſaid and underſtood to lie to God?

(35.) Acts 7. 59. *They ſtoned* Stephen, *calling upon God, and ſaying, Lord Jeſus, receive my Spirit. Anſw.* (1.) The word *God* is not in the Original Greek, in no Greek Bible. (2.) Admitting this word *God* to be here rightly underſtood, yet the Greek when rendred Grammatically, maketh this ſenſe, calling upon God, and ſaying, *O Lord of Jeſus*, receive my Spirit. (3.) Admitting the Engliſh Tranſlation, the meaning here is only this, *Stephen* called upon God, and he alſo ſaid, Lord Jeſus, receive my Spirit; becauſe at the ſame time he ſaw Jeſus (in Prophetick Viſion) ſtanding at the right Hand of God. He began to have this Viſion while he ſtood before the Council, *ver.* 56. and it continued with him to the Moment of his Expiration, for his Conſolation and Support; as is granted by many learned Interpreters of the Orthodox Party.

(36.) Acts 9. 14, 21. *To bind all that call upon thy Name.* (The Words are ſpoken to the Lord Chriſt, as is made undeniable by ver. 17.) ——*Is not this he, that deſtroyed them which called on this Name* (Chriſt's Name) *in* Jeruſalem? *Anſw.* 1. The *Socinians* generally not only grant, but earneſtly contend, that Chriſt is to be worſhipped and prayed to: becauſe God hath (they ſay) by his inhabiting *Word* or Power given to the Lord Chriſt, a Faculty of knowing all things, and an Ability to relieve all our Wants. The Polonian *Unitarians* were ſo zealous in this matter, that they excommunicated and depoſed from their Miniſtry, ſuch of their own Party as denied that Chriſt might be prayed to, and worſhip'd with Divine Worſhip. This had bad Effects, therefore the *Unitarians* of *Tranſilvania* were more moderate, they admitted to the Miniſters and Profeſſors-Places, thoſe that rejected the Invocation and Adoration of Chriſt; but obliged them under their Hands, not to ſpeak againſt worſhipping or praying to the Lord Chriſt in their Sermons or Lectures. 2. Thoſe *Unitarians* that reject the Invocation of Chriſt, ſay, 1. That the moſt learned of the Ancients were of their Opinion. It appears by St. *Auſtin* (*T. 6. L.* 1. *de Hæreſ. Num.* 43.) and by *Photius* (*Cod.* 117.) that *Origen* denied that the Son was to be adored or prayed to. He is, ſaith *Origen*, not the Author, but Procurer of the good things beſtowed on us. See alſo *Origen de Orat. ſect.* 1. and *contra Celſum*, l. 8. In both which places he expreſly denies, that Chriſt is to be invocated. Nor can it be doubted, that *Origen* ſpoke the ſenſe of the Catholick Church of his time. 2. Our Lord Chriſt, when he was conſulted about the Object and Matter of Prayers, directed his Diſciples to God; *Luke* 11. 1, 2. *When ye pray, ſay, Our Father which art in Heaven.* 3. It ſeems clear enough, that he forbad the Diſciples to pray to himſelf; ordering them at the ſame time to pray to God in his Name, or *for his Sake:* John 16. 23. *In that Day* (*i. e.* after I am riſen, have ſeen you again, and being aſcended into Heaven, have procured for you the Comforter, whoſe Conſolations none can take from you. So all Interpreters of note) *ye ſhall ask me nothing;* ——*whatſoever ye ſhall ask the Father in my Name, he will give it you.* 4. To make Chriſt himſelf the Object of Prayer, is to deſtroy his Mediatory Office. For if he doth hear our Prayers, and can and doth (by a Power conſtantly reſident in him) relieve our Wants; to what purpoſe is he our Mediator with God? They that make it a Duty to pray to Chriſt, will find it hard to give a good account of thoſe Words, *Heb.* 7. 25. *He* (Chriſt) *is able to ſave unto the uttermoſt, all that come unto God by him,* (*i. e.* that pray to God in his Name, or *for his Sake*) *ſeeing he ever liveth to make Interceſſion for them.* What can be more evident, than that here Chriſt's ſaving us from the Evils we either fear or labour under, is aſcribed not to his own inherent Power, but to his Interceſſion with the Almighty. It is farther to be obſerved, that theſe Gentlemen ſay, that Chriſt's Mediation and Interceſſion for us, is not to be underſtood of a verbal or perſonal Mediation, proceeding from a particular knowledg of our Wants and Prayers, but *he mediates by his Merits*; that is, by the perfect Obedience, and moſt acceptable Services that he has performed to God.

As to the objected Texts, *To bind all that call upon thy Name.* And again, Is not this he that deſtroyed *them that called on this Name* in *Jeruſalem?* They anſwer, that the Original Greek may be tranſlated ſeveral ways. 1. Thus, to bind all *that are called by* thy Name. And, Is not this he, that deſtroyed them *who are called by this Name* in *Jeruſalem?* that is, All that from *Chriſt* are called *Chriſtians.* And this ſeems to be the genuine Senſe of theſe Texts. 2. Thus, To bind all *that name thy Name.* And, Is not this he that deſtroyed them *who name this Name* in *Jeruſalem?* that is, that profeſs the Name of Chriſt, that ſpeak of Chriſt as their Maſter and Teacher. Agreeably to this, St. *Paul* ſaith, 2 Tim. 2. 9. *Let all that name the Name of Chriſt, depart from Iniquity.* 3. Thus, as 'tis in our Engliſh Bibles, to bind all that *call upon thy Name.* And, Is not this he that deſtroyed them *that called on this Name* in *Jeruſalem?* For though the firſt

Christians did not pray to the Lord Christ, yet they called upon his Name in Prayer, they used his Name in their Prayers to God, praying for all things in his Name; which is *a calling upon his Name* in the most proper and grammatical Sense of these Words; and is indeed the only Sense of which they are capable, when they are used of a Man, as Christ was. So they.

(37.) Acts 15. 28. *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us.* *Answ.* That is, to God's Inspiration in us, and therefore to us also: See on *John* 16. 8, 13, 14.

(38.) Acts 20. 28. *Feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own Blood.* *Answ.* 1. It appears by the *Syriac*, the *Armenian*, and the most ancient Greek Bibles, that the true reading of this Text is, Feed the Church of *Christ*, which he hath purchased with his own Blood. 2. Admitting the reading in the vulgar Editions of the Greek, yet some great Masters of that Tongue have rendred the Greek Words thus, Feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with *his own Son's Blood.* 3. Admitting the Translation in our English Bibles, some learned Men (particularly *Erasmus*) have noted, that the Blood of Christ is here called the Blood of God, because it was *the Blood which God gave* for the Redemption of the World. So John 1. 36. *Behold the Lamb of God:* that is, the Lamb of Sacrifice *which God giveth* for the Sins of the World. For God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son to die and shed his Blood for us. From,

SIR,

Your

Faithful and Assured.

A Fourth Letter

Concerning the

UNITARIANS,

Vulgarly Called

SOCINIANS.

SIR,

WE are come to the laſt part of our Task, the Texts of the Epiſtles and Revelation, and the Anſwers of the *Socinians* to them.

(1.) Rom. 1.3. *Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, which was made of the Seed of* David, *according to the Fleſh.* Rom. 9. 5. *Of whom, as concerning the Fleſh, Chriſt came; who is over all, God bleſſed for ever. Amen. Cyprian adv. Jud.* l. 2. c. 5. *Hilarius* in *Pſal.* 12. *Anſw.* 1. It is very probable, by the *Syriac*, and by ſome Paſſages in *Ignatius* and other Fathers, that the Word *God* was not originally in this Text, for they read it thus, Of whom as concerning the Fleſh Chriſt came, *who* is bleſſed *above* all for ever. 2. But admitting the reading in the vulgar Editions of the Greek, the Greek Words (as *Eraſmus* and *Curcellæus* obſerve) ſhould have been thus tranſlated, Of whom, as concerning the Fleſh, Chriſt came; *God who is over all be bleſſed for ever.* For the Words are a Thankſgiving for Chriſt, and for his Exaltation. The Addition of the word *Amen*, proper in Prayers and Thankſgivings, doth much countenance this Tranſlation. 3. Theſe Words, *according to the Fleſh*, and *as concerning the Fleſh*, never ſignify (as *Trinitarians* would here interpret them) *according to his Human Nature*, as if Chriſt had alſo a Divine Nature: *Rom.* 9. 3. My Kinſmen *according to the Fleſh.* Rom. 4. 1. *Abraham*, our Father *as pertaining to the Fleſh.* Col. 3. 22. *Servants obey in all things your Maſters according to the Fleſh.* Had now *Abraham* or *Paul*'s Kinſmen, or have Maſters a Divine Nature, becauſe theſe Words, *according to the Fleſh*, and *as pertaining to the Fleſh*, are uſed of them? The Truth is, theſe Phraſes are only as much as to ſay *according to the Body*; and are to ſignify that *Abraham* is the Father of the *Jews*, according to their Bodies, as God is the Father of their Souls or Spirits: and that the *Jews* were *Paul*'s Kinſmen according to

the Body, but not of Kin to him in Reſpect of Likeneſs in Faith or Manners: alſo that Maſters are Maſters over our Bodies, not of our Minds or Spirits. Therefore in the other Texts alſo, where Chriſt is ſaid to be of the Seed of *Abraham*, of *Iſrael*, and of *David*, *according to the Fleſh*; the meaning can only be, that as to his Body, or outward Man, he deſcended of the Houſe of *David*, and of the Stock of *Iſrael* and *Abraham*, his Soul or Spirit being from God.

(2.) Rom. 2. 16. *God ſhall judg the Secrets of Men by Jeſus Chriſt.* 1 Cor. 4. 5. *Who both will bring to light the hidden things of Darkneſs, and will make manifeſt the Counſels of Hearts.* *Anſw.* The Knowledg Chriſt hath, or at the laſt Judgment ſhall have, *of the Secrets of Hearts*, is purely by Revelation from God, and the Divine *Word* communicated to him; Rev. 1. 1. *The Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, which God gave to him to ſhew unto his Servants.*

(3.) Rom. 10. 12. *The ſame Lord over all, is rich unto all that call upon him.* *Anſw.* This, and what follows, is ſpoken of God, not of Chriſt.

(4.) 1 Cor. 1. 2, 3. *All that in every place call upon the Name of Jeſus Chriſt.* Ver. 3. *Grace be to you, and Peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jeſus.* *Anſw.* 1. As to the former of theſe Texts, ſee on *Acts* 9. 14, 21. For all that is there ſaid, takes place here alſo. 2. But as to *Ver.* 3. it ſhows plainly that Chriſt is not God, for it ſpeaks of him as a diſtinct and different Perſon from God: Therefore Grace and Peace is wiſhed to the *Corinthians* from God, *as the Author* of every good and perfect Gift; and from Chriſt, (to uſe the Words of *Origen*) *as the Procurer*, by his Interceſſion with God.

(5.) 1 Cor. 6. 9. *Your Body is the Temple of the Holy Ghoſt.* 2 Cor. 6. 16. *Ye are Temples of the living God.* *Anſw.* The Holy Ghoſt, or Spirit, being the Inſpiration and Power of God, the ſame Bodies that are Temples of one, muſt needs be Temples alſo of the other.

(6.) 1 Cor. 10. 9. *Neither let us tempt Chriſt, as ſome of them alſo tempted, and were deſtroyed of Serpents.* It had been ſaid before, at *Ver.* 4. *They drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Chriſt.* *Anſw.* 1. The Rock was Chriſt; not really, but *in Signification*, it ſignified and prefigured Chriſt, for which reaſon 'tis called *a ſpiritual Rock.* So St. *Auſtin*, *contr. Adverſ. Leg. & Prophet. l.* 2. *c.* 6. This Interpretation is confirmed by Inſtances of like Nature, *Gen.* 41. 26. *The ſeven good Kine are ſeven Years, and the ſeven good Ears are ſeven Years:* that is, they ſignify and prefigure ſeven Years of Plenty. This Rock prefigured Chriſt, as he is the true Rock of his People and Church: Its Waters only ſignified Chriſt; for as they were the Refreſhment and Life of the *Iſraelites* in the Wilderneſs, ſo is Chriſt of the true *Iſrael* of God, in the howling Wilderneſs of this preſent World. 2. Whereas we are bid, at *Ver.* 9. not to tempt *Chriſt*; 'tis to be noted that the ancient and true reading of this Text is, Let us not tempt *God*. *S. Epiphanius* hath left upon record, that it was the Heretick *Marcion* who corrupted this Text, by putting *Chriſt* for *God* in the Copies by him publiſhed, *Epiphan. L.* 1. *T.* 3. *p.* 358. *Edit. Petav.* But admitting the reading in the Engliſh Bibles, yet the ſenſe will be, Let us not tempt (that is, murmur againſt) *Chriſt*; as the *Iſraelites* tempted or murmured againſt *God* in the Wilderneſs. That tempting God and Chriſt, is rightly interpreted by *murmuring againſt* them, appears by *Numb.* 14. 27, 28, 29.

(7.) 1 Cor. 12. 4, 5, 6, 11. *There are diverſities of Gifts, but the ſame Spirit*; —— *Differences of Adminiſtrations, but the ſame Lord*; —— *Diverſities of Operations, but it is the ſame God which worketh all in all.* —— *All theſe worketh that one and the ſame Spirit.* *Anſw.* The plain meaning is, God and his Spirit; that is, God by his Spirit and Inſpiration, worketh that great Diverſity of Gifts, (Prophecy, Tongues, Healing) which were in the Chriſtians of thoſe Times: and that though there are different Adminiſtrations (that is, Orders of Men) in the Church, yet they are all under one Lord or Head, even Chriſt.

(8.) 2 Cor.

(8.) 2 Cor. 8. 9. *Ye know the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor, that we through his poverty might become rich. Answ.* The sense is, Such was the Favour and Love of Christ to Mankind, that in his own Person he set us an Example of Mortification and Self-denial, in his living a poor sort of Life; though 'tis certain he could have lived in the greatest Splendor, Dignity, and Plenty. He that could multiply the Loaves and Fishes, and the Wine at the Wedding of *Cana*, need not have wanted any of the Comforts of Life; if for our Sakes (that we *Gentiles* might be rich and blessed for ever) he had not chose to imploy himself in Preaching, and making Disciples who might be his Agents in planting the Word of the Gospel over all the World.

(9.) 2 Cor. 12. 8, 9. *I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me.——Therefore I will rather glory in my Infirmities, that the Power of Christ may rest on me. Answ.* He besought *the Lord*, that is, he besought *God*. The Power of Christ here, is the Strength or Power *which Christ procures*, by his general Mediation (for all his Church, and every Member of it) with God. So the sense is, that what my Lord Christ can do and procure for me with God, may abide on me, namely, Power and Strength either to overcome or bear this Affliction. But note, that the *Socinians*, for the most part of them, do grant that *the Word* or Power of God abiding on Christ, doth qualify him, both to hear our Prayers, and to succour us in all Distresses.

(10.) 2 Cor. 13. 14. *The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost be with you. Answ.* 1. This Text demonstrates, that neither the Lord Christ, nor the Holy Spirit are God, for it plainly distinguishes them from God. 2. The sense of the whole Verse is, I wish you the continual Favour and Intercession of Christ; for you are not unknown to him, seeing the Angels (of whom he is made King and Head) signify to him your State and Condition, *Rev.* 3. 6. *Heb.* 1. 14. I wish you, as an Effect of Christ's Intercession, the Love of God or the Father; and as the Consequence of that, a plentiful Communication of God's Holy Spirit or Inspiration, together with all the Effects of it.

(11.) Gal. 1. 1, 12. Paul *an Apostle, not of Man, neither by Man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father. ——I neither received it of Man, neither was I taught it, but by Revelation of Jesus Christ. Answ.* As we truly say, the Holy Bible is the Word not of Men, but of God; because though it was spoken and written by Men, yet it proceedeth (as to the matter of it) from the Inspiration of, and Direction from God: So *Paul* rightly denies he is made an Apostle by Man, because he was made one by Jesus Christ, who in all things acted by the Spirit and Directions of God. Briefly, *Not of Man, neither by Man* in these Verses, is only as much as to say, not by humane Authority, but by Authority from God by the Lord Christ.

(12.) Eph. 3. 9. *Who created all things by Jesus Christ. Answ.* Though the Words might have been rendred, Who created all things *for* Jesus Christ, (see on *Heb.* 1. 2.) yet the truth is, these Words, *by* or *for Jesus Christ*, were not originally in this Text, but added to it. For it appears by the most ancient Greek Copies, and by the Syriac and Latin, as also by several of the Fathers, that the true reading here is only thus, *Who created all things.*

(13.) Phil. 2. 5, 6, 7, 8. *Let this Mind be in you, which was in Christ Jesus; who being in the Form of God, thought it not Robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no Reputation, and took upon him the Form of a Servant. And being found in Fashion as a Man; he humbled himself, and became obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Cross: Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name above every Name. Answ.* It cannot be the Design of the former part of these Words, to intimate that Christ is God; because 'tis at last added, that *God hath exalted him, and given him a Name above every Name*;

for

for these Words plainly distinguish Christ from God, as one who is not himself God, but *exalted by God*. This and other Considerations, has obliged the more judicious and learned *Trinitarians*, to interpret this whole Context of Christ, *as he is a Man*, and to translate somewhat otherways than we have done in the English. They render and interpret the Words thus;

Ver. 5. *Let this Mind be in you, that was in Christ Jesus*; i. e. be ye humble and lowly as the Lord Christ was, *ver.* 3, 4.

Ver. 6. *Who being in the Form of God*; *i. e.* who being made like to God; and namely by a Communication to him of Divine and miraculous Power over Diseases, Devils, the Grave, the Wind, the Seas, *&c.*

Committed not Robbery by equalling himself to God; *i. e.* did not rob God of his Honour, by arrogating to himself to be God, or equal to God.

Ver. 7. *But made himself of no Reputation*; *i. e.* chose a poor Life, like a Person of no Reputation or Merit.

And took upon him the Form of a Servant; *i. e.* became like a Servant; possessing nothing of his own, and suffering Injuries and Reproaches, without making Reply or seeking Revenge. Being a Preacher of Mortification, Humility and Self-denial, he lived up to the height of his Doctrine.

Ver. 8. *Being made like other Men, in the common Similitude of Man*; *he humbled himself, and became obedient unto Death*; *i. e.* being a Man in all respects like other Men, (Sin excepted) he always expressed a great Humility; and notwithstanding that he could have delivered himself from them, yet was he obedient even to evil Magistrates; and without Resistance underwent that Death, which their Wickedness and Malice prepared for him.

Ver. 9. *Wherefore God hath highly exalted him.* For this, as well as other Causes, he is now by God advanced even above Angels; the very Angels being put under his Directions.

(14.) Phil. 3. 21. *Who shall change our vile Body, that it may be fashioned like to his glorious Body; according to the mighty working whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself.* *Answ.* See on *John* 6. 44. and on *John* 5. 19. places parallel to this.

(15.) Col. 1. 15. *The Image of the invisible God.* Heb. 1. 3. *The express Image of his Person.* *Answ.* 1. These Texts are Demonstrations that Christ is not God; it being simply impossible, that the Image should be the very being or thing whose Image it is. 2. Those that alledg these Texts to prove that Christ is God, forget that St. *Paul* saith of every Man, that he is *the Image and Glory of God*, 1 Cor. 11. 7.

(16.) Col. 1. 15, 16. *The Image of the invisible God, the first-born of every Creature. For by him were all things created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth. ——And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.* *Answ.* 1. Christ is called the first-born of every Creature, not absolutely, as if he was in being before all other Creatures; but the meaning is, he is *the first-born from the dead* of all God's Creatures. He is the first that was raised from the dead (and thus as it were born again into the World) so as never to die again, but forthwith injoy eternal Life. Thus in this very Context is *the first-born* explained, *ver.* 18. *He is the Head of the Body the Church, who is the Beginning, the first-born from the Dead.* 2. These Words, *For by him were all things created*, &c. are not spoken of Christ, but of God. The sense of the whole Context is this, (from *v.* 15, to *ver.* 19.) The Lord Christ is the most perfect Image of the invisible God, the first-born *from the Dead* of every Creature; for (O *Colossians*) by him, even by the invisible God, were all things created; they were not (as some of your Philosophers have taught you) from all Eternity, nor (as others say) arose from the accidental Concourse of Atoms, but all of them (whether things in Heaven, or things in Earth; whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers) are Creatures, and were by God created, who is before them

them all, and by him they all consist. But he is the Head of the Body the Church, who is the Beginning and first-born from the Dead, even the Lord Christ. 3. They observe farther, that the most learned and critical Interpreters of the *Trinitarians*, do not think that Creation is in this Context ascribed to Christ. They interpret this Context thus, *The most Beloved* (so first-born is used by the *Hebrews* and *Hellenists*; Exod. 4. 22. Psal. 89. 27. Jer. 31. 9.) *of every Creature, or the Chief and Head* of every Creature. So *Camero*, *Piscator*, *Diodat*, *Dally*, *Vorstius*, *Davenant*, *Grotius*. *For by him were all things modelled, whether they be things in Heaven, or things in Earth*, modelled, not created. So of the Ancients, even *Athanasius*, and St. *Cyril*, *Procopius Gazeus*, and *Fulgentius*: So also *Alfonsus Salmero*, *Arias Montanus*, *Grotius*, and many more. The Lord Christ is said to model (or order) all things on Earth, because of the great change he introduced; abolishing Judaism and Paganism, (the only Religions then in the World) and introducing Christianity in their stead. He new ordered or modelled the Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, Powers, (and other Angelick Orders) in Heaven, in that he became their Head and King (whereas they were before immediately under God) and giveth to them from time to time such Orders and Directions as to him seem good, 1 *Pet.* 3. 22. *Rev.* 1. 1. *Rev.* 5. 6.

Whereas 'tis added at *ver.* 17. *He is before all things:* They understand it thus, he is in Worth and Excellence, as well as Dignity and Power, before all other Persons and things. *And by him all things consist*; *i. e.* By his wise Providence and Government they consist, or fall into no Disorder and Confusion. 4. St. *Chrysostom* goes a way by himself. He understands indeed, *ver.* 16. of Christ, but he renders it not, for *by* him were all things created, but thus, *the most beloved of every Creature*, for *for* him were all things created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, *&c.* So that the sense here is the same with what is said, *Heb.* 1. 2. *Whom he* (God) *hath appointed Heir of all things*; *i. e.* All things were originally made with respect to Christ, that they might be subjected one day to him, and he be made Heir or Lord (under God his Father) of them.

(17.) Col. 2. 3. *In him are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledg. Answ.* 1. The *Socinians* grant, that in Christ are inestimable Treasures of Wisdom, given to him by God. But, 2. It has been observed by others, that this particular Verse and its Context should have been thus translated, To the Acknowledgment of the Mystery of God *even* the Father, and of Christ, in *which* (*i. e.* in which Mystery) are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledg.

(18.) Col. 2. 9. *In him dwelleth the Fulness of the Godhead bodily, and ye are compleat in him*; or, ye are *filled by him. Answ.* 1. 'Tis also said, *Ephes.* 3. 9. That ye (ye *Ephesians*) might be filled with all the Fulness of God. And this very Text of the *Colossians* saith, That the Fulness of God (or of the Godhead) is so in Christ, that we are filled by him with the same. Therefore the Fulness of God, or of the Godhead here, is *the Fulness of the Knowledg of God*, or of the Godhead: this dwelt in Christ, and with this he hath *filled* or *compleated* us Christians. This Knowledg is said to dwell in Christ bodily, or (as others translate) substantially; in Opposition to that imperfect umbratile and unsincere Knowledg of God, that was to be found in the Philosophy and Philosophers of the Greeks, who in *Paul*'s Time were in great Esteem among the *Colossians* and other Greek Nations and Colonies. This Interpretation is confirmed by *Ver.* 8. and allowed by the most Learned and Orthodox Interpreters.

(19.) 1 Thess. 3. 11, 12. *God himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ direct* (in the Greek, *prosper*) *our way unto you. Answ.* Paul *wisheth* that the Lord Christ may prosper his Way; meaning, by his general Intercession with God, for all his Ministers and other Labourers in the Gospel; as also by his Angels, who are Christ's Agents, sent forth to minister to (*i. e.* to protect and help)

help) thoſe that ſhall be Heirs of Salvation, *Heb.* 1. 14. 1 *Pet.* 3. 22. *Rev.* 1. 1. *Rev.* 5. 6. But it is added, at *Ver.* 12. of this third to the *Coloſſians*, *And the Lord make you to increaſe and abound in Love.* *Anſw.* If theſe Words are to be underſtood of Chriſt, it muſt be ſaid, That the Lord Chriſt cauſeth us to abound in Love, and all other Graces; partly by his Goſpel, partly by his Interceſſion with him, who is the Giver of every good and perfect Gift, *Heb.* 7. 25. See alſo what has been ſaid on *Acts* 9. 14, 21.

(20.) 2 Theſſ. 2. 16, 17. *Our Lord Jeſus, ——comfort your Hearts; and eſtabliſh you in every good Word and Work.* *Anſw.* See on 1 *Theſſ.* 3. 11, 12.

(21.) 1 Tim. 3. 6. *Without Controverſy, great is the Myſtery of Godlineſs, God was manifeſt in the Fleſh, juſtified in the Spirit, ſeen of Angels,—believed on in the World, received up into Glory.* *Anſw.* It appears by the Syriac, Latin, Ethiopick, Armenian, Arabick, and moſt ancient *Greek* Bibles; as alſo by the firſt Council of *Nice*, and a great many Citations out of the Fathers, both Greek and Latin; that the Word *God* was not originally in this Text, but added to it: For they read it thus, *Without Controverſy great is the Myſtery of Godlineſs, which was manifeſt by Fleſh*, (that is, by Man, by the Miniſtry of Men, even Jeſus and his Apoſtles) *juſtified by the Spirit*; (*i. e.* proved by Miracles done by the Spirit or Power of God) *ſeen of Angels*, (*i. e.* diſcovered to Angels, who greatly deſired to underſtand this Secret, and the Particulars and Cauſes of it, *Epheſ.* 3. 10, 11. 1 *Pet.* 1. 12.) *believed on in the World, received with Glory*; that is, entertained in moſt places with the greateſt Reſpect and Honour, *Gal.* 4. 15. Note, that the Goſpel is here called *a Myſtery*, becauſe it was ſo long concealed, and ſo late diſcovered: and the Myſtery *of Godlineſs*, from its Effect; namely, becauſe it diſpoſeth Mens Minds to true Piety and Godlineſs. Note alſo, that it was *Macedonius* (the Second,) *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, that corrupted this Text, by ſubſtitution of the word *God* inſtead of the word *which*; and for this and other Matters, he was depoſed in an Epiſcopal Council, and baniſhed by the Emperor *Anaſtaſius*, about the Year 512. The word [*God*] in this Context, is rejected by the firſt Council of *Nice*. But, 2. admitting the word *God* were truly read in the vulgar Copies of the Greek; yet if you will make ſenſe, you muſt thus tranſlate and interpret, *Great is the Myſtery of Godlineſs, God was manifeſted by Fleſh*, (*i. e.* God's Nature and Will was manifeſted by Fleſh, that is, by Man, by Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles, to us *Gentiles*); *was juſtified by the Spirit*, (*i. e.* the ſame Will and Nature of God, was verified by Miracles done by the Spirit or Power of God); *was ſeen of Angels*, (was known to the Angels, who were very deſirous to underſtand this new Revelation); *believed on in the World*; *received with Glory*, or *gloriouſly*.

(22.) 1 Tim. 6. 14, 15, 16. *Until the appearing of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which in his time he ſhall ſhew, who is the Bleſſed and only Potentate*; ——*whom no Man hath ſeen, nor can ſee.* *Anſw.* The laſt words ſhew, that not the Lord Chriſt, but God is deſigned in this whole Deſcription.

(23.) 2 Tim. 3. 16. *All Scripture is given by Inſpiration from God.* 2 Pet. 1. 21. *Holy Men of God ſpake as they were moved by the Holy Ghoſt.* *Anſw.* The Holy Ghoſt, or Spirit, being only the Inſpiration and Power of God, it is truly ſaid, that the Scriptures which proceeded from that Inſpiration, did proceed from God; and that thoſe who were acted by that Inſpiration, were acted by God.

(24.) Titus 2. 13. *Looking for the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.* *Anſw.* 1. Nothing hinders but that we may believe, that not only the Lord Chriſt, but God himſelf, will appear at the laſt Judgment. So that Chriſt is ſaid to judg the World, becauſe he ſhall pronounce the Decree and Sentence of God, and order the Angels to execute it. So ſeveral of the Fathers underſtood this Text. 2. But the Truth is, the Words in the Greek are thus, Looking for the appearing *of the Glory*

of

of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ. Where *the Glory of the great God* is the Pomp, Power, and Angels, that God, even the Father, will cause to accompany the Lord Christ on that Day. Matth. 16. 27. *The Son shall appear in the Glory of his Father, with his* (the Fathers) *Angels.*

(25.) Heb. 1. 2. *By whom also he made the Worlds. Answ. Grotius* renders the Greek thus, *For* whom he made the Worlds. The Author (saith *Grotius*) writing to the *Hebrews*, refers to a Maxim received among them, that the World was made for the *Messias*. This Translation suits well with what went before, *whom he hath appointed Heir of all things*: for what can be more agreeable, than that the World should be made for him, who is appointed Heir or Lord of it? Others render the Words thus, By whom he made *the Ages*; understanding hereby, the Gospel-Ages, or Times.

(26.) Heb. 1. 3. *Upholding all things by the Word of his Power; or, governing all things by his Powerful Word. Answ.* This is to be understood of God's *Word* or Power, not of Christ's, otherways than it was communicated to him by God, and did abide on him. For the whole Context runs thus, *Who* (Christ) *being the Brightness of his* (God's) *Glory, and the express Image of his* (God's) *Person, and upholding* (in the Greek, Governing) *all things by his* (God's) *powerful Word.* So the sense is, Christ upholds the Government and Order of the Church both in Heaven and Earth, he governs the Angels and Spirits of Heaven, and the Church militant on Earth, by *the Word* (*i. e.* the Power) of God given to him without measure. See also on *John* 1. 1, &c.

(27.) Heb. 1. 5. *Thou art my Son. Answ.* See on *Psal.* 2. 7. in the second Letter.

(28.) Heb. 1. 6. *Again, when he bringeth the First-begotten into the World, he saith, And let all the Angels of God worship him. Answ.* See on *Psal.* 97. 7. in the second Letter. But as to the word First-begotten, or First-born, it doth not belong to Christ only, in all the senses of it. Christ is Almighty, God's First-begotten, or First-born *from the Dead*, as was said on *Col.* 1. 16. but in other respects others also are so called. *Israel* is God's First-born, *Exod.* 4. 22. and *David*, Psal. 89. 26, 27. for this Expression in the Hebrew, signifies ordinarily, no more than the most Beloved, or *much* Beloved, as is apparent from the Texts last cited, and from *Jer.* 31. 9. *Heb.* 11. 17.

(29.) Heb. 1. 8. *Unto the Son, he saith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever. Answ.* In the Greek 'tis, Unto the Son he saith, *God is thy Throne* (*i. e.* thy Seat, Resting-Place, and Establishment) *for ever.* So *Grotius.*

(30.) Heb. 1. 10. *And thou, Lord, in the Beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth. Answ.* See on *Psal.* 102. 25. from whence these words are taken.

(31.) Heb. 2. 14. *For as much as the Children are partakers of Flesh and Blood, he also himself took part of the same. Answ.* The *Socinians* do not deny, that the Soul of Christ took part in Flesh and Blood, that is, was incarnate; as his Children, (that is, his People) were also Partakers in Flesh and Blood.

(32.) Heb. 2. 16. *He took not on him the Nature of Angels, but he took on him the Seed of* Abraham. *Answ.* In the Greek, and in the Margin of our Bibles, 'tis, *He taketh not hold of Angels*, (*i. e.* he saved not from Ruin, and from utter and final falling into Perdition, the Apostate Angels) *but of the Seed of* Abraham *he taketh hold*; *i. e.* he saveth the Seed of *Abraham.* The Author here mentioneth only the Seed of *Abraham*, because this Epistle was written only to the *Hebrews.* Unless perhaps by the Seed of *Abraham*, he meaneth *Abraham*'s Spiritual Seed, all the Faithful, all true Believers.

(33.) Heb. 3. 3, 6. *He who hath builded the House, hath more Honour than the House.* ——*Christ as a Son over his own House, whose House are we. Answ. The House* here is not Men's *Bodies*, but *the Church* of Christ; which (under God) he is truly said to build, partly by himself, partly by his Ministers.

(34.) Heb. 4. 15, 16. *We have not an High-Priest, which cannot be touched with the Feeling of our Infirmities; but was in all points tempted as we are.* ——*Let us therefore come boldly unto the Throne of Grace.* *Answ.* We are encouraged here to pray with Assurance and Faith to God, by this Argument or Consideration, that our High-Priest and Intercessor having been in our very Circumstances, is touched with a true Feeling of our Infirmities, and therefore doth with great Earnestnest intercede for us all in general.

(35.) Heb. 7. 3. *Without Father, without Mother,* ——*having neither Beginning of Days, nor end of Life: but made like unto the Son of God, abideth a Priest for ever.* *Answ.* All acknowledg that these Words are spoken of *Melchizedec.* And that because neither his Father nor his Mother, nor the time of his Birth or Death, are mentioned in Scripture; he is therefore said to be without Father or Mother, and without Beginning of Days, or end of Life. But he is not herein like the Son of God (the time of whose Birth and Death is recorded in Scripture; and whose Mother was blessed *Mary*, and his Father the everlasting God) but he is like the Son of God, in that he abideth a Priest for ever.

(36.) Heb. 10. 5. *A Body hast thou prepared for me.* *Answ.* 'Tis undoubted, that God prepared a Body for the Soul of Christ.

(37.) Heb. 11. 26. *Esteeming* (*i. e. Moses* esteeming) *the Reproach of Christ, greater Riches than the Treasures of* Egypt. *Answ.* The sense is, *Moses* preferred being reproached and ill used by *Pharaoh* and the *Egyptians* (as Christ was reproached and abused, when he came to deliver the true *Israel* of God, from the Bondage of Sin and Satan) before all the Treasures and Riches, which he, as an adopted Son of *Pharaoh*'s Daughter, might have expected and had in *Egypt*. So *Grotius*, and others, the most esteemed Interpreters.

(38.) Heb. 13. 8. *Jesus, the same yesterday, to day, and for ever.* *Answ.* This is prefaced to what here follows, *Be not carried away with divers and strange Doctrines*, as an Argument to perswade to Constancy in the true Faith. The sense is, the Lord Christ and his Gospel, is the same thing that it always was; be not therefore carried about to every novel Doctrine. Ye will by Experience find, that 'tis a good thing to be established in the Grace of the Gospel; and not in Doctrines about Meats, which the *Jews* from the Mosaick Law, and the *Gentiles* from the Dictates of their Philosophers, so much urge.

(39.) 1 Pet. 1. 11. *Searching what, and what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the Sufferings of Christ.* *Answ.* 1. The Spirit of Christ, that is, the same *Spirit of Prophecy* that was in Christ, *Gal.* 4. 6. 2 *Cor.* 4. 10. Or, 2. the Prophetick Spirit in them *which spoke of Christ.* So *Grotius* interprets here. Others confirm his Interpretation, by observing, that *the Spirit of Truth*, and *the Spirit of Error* mentioned 1 *John* 4. 6. are those Spirits which speak the Truth, and teach Error. So we call *Virgil* the Poet of *Eneas*, and *Homer* of *Achilles* and *Ulisses*, because they have written and spoken of *Eneas*, *Achilles*, and *Ulisses*.

(40.) 1 Pet. 3. 19, 20. *Quickned by the Spirit, by which also he went and preached to the Spirits in Prison, which sometimes were disobedient,* ——*in the days of* Noah. *Answ.* This Text seems to speak of Christ's descent into Hell. The sense is, Christ being dead, was shortly quickned, or brought to Life again by the Spirit or Power of God: by which also (that is, by assistance of which Spirit) he preached and spoke to the Spirits imprisoned in Hell, who would not hearken to *Noah* who in his Life-time preached Righteousness to them, 2 *Pet.* 2. 5. *Cardinal Bellarmine* has quoted above thirty of the Fathers, who interpret this Text after this manner. The Interpretation seems confirmed by 1 *Pet.* 4. 6. *For this cause was the Gospel preached also to them that are Dead.* For that he speaketh of the real Dead, appears by the foregoing verse.

(41.)

(41.) 1 John 1. 1, &c. *That which was from the Beginning, ——which we have ſeen with our Eyes, ——of the Word of Life, ——declare we unto you. Anſw.* The Word of Life here, is the Goſpel. The ſenſe is, we declare or preach to you that Goſpel or Word of Life, which from the Beginning *was in the Mind and Decree of the Father.* So St. *John* explains himſelf in theſe Words at *ver.* 3. *That eternal Life which was with the Father, and was manifeſted to us.* He calleth the Word of Life, eternal Life; as 'tis the ordinary and appointed means and way to eternal Life. He ſaith, he had *heard* it, and *ſeen* it with his Eyes, and *handled* it with his Hands; to ſignify by theſe Expreſſions, that it was fully, certainly, and perfectly known to him. For the Hebrews uſe to expreſs full and certain Knowledg of things, by Words and Phraſes borrowed from the Senſes.

(42.) 1 John 3. 16. *Hereby perceive we the Love of God, becauſe he laid down his Life for us. Anſw.* Neither the Syriac, nor almoſt any Greek Copy of the Bible, hath the Word *God* in this Text. The true reading is, hereby perceive we *his* Love, becauſe he (Chriſt) laid down his Life for us. 2. Admitting the reading in the Engliſh Bible, yet *he* in this Text is not God; but Chriſt *the Son of God*, who was mentioned *ver.* 8. So *Grotius.* And the Interpretation is certain, for God cannot lay down his Life.

(43.) 1 John 4. 3. *Every Spirit that confeſſeth not, that Chriſt is come in the Fleſh, is not of God. Anſw.* This ſaying, *is come in the Fleſh*, (or in Fleſh, for ſo 'tis in the Greek) is oppoſed to thoſe falſe Prophets and Teachers, that affirmed Chriſt had not a real Body of Fleſh and Blood, but a Spiritual; and conſequently was not a true Man, nor the Off-ſpring of *David.* On the contrary St. *John* here teaches that Chriſt *is come in Fleſh*, or in the Fleſh; that is, was clothed with a real Body of real Fleſh.

(44.) 1 John 5. 7. *There are three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt, and theſe three are one. Anſw.* 1. This Verſe was not originally in the Bible, but has been added to it. 'Tis not found in the moſt ancient Copies of the *Greek*, nor in the *Syriac*, or *Arabick*, or *Ethiopick*, or *Armenian* Bibles, nor in the moſt ancient Latin Bibles. 'Tis not acknowledged by the Fathers, who treated profeſſedly of this Queſtion of the Trinity; 'tis wholly rejected by abundance of the moſt Learned Criticks and Interpreters, and by all acknowledged to be doubtful and uncertain. 2. Admitting this Verſe to be genuine, yet the moſt Learned *Trinitarians* confeſs the ſenſe is, not *theſe three are one God*, but theſe three are *one in their Teſtimony*, or they agree in their Teſtimony; for they are here conſidered and ſpoken of as Witneſſes. So *Beza*, *Vatablus*, *Calvin*, *Eraſmus*, the Engliſh *Geneva* Notes. And accordingly moſt of the Greek Bibles which have this Verſe in them, read here as they do in the next Verſe (not theſe three *are* one, but) theſe three *agree* in one; *i. e.* in one and the ſame Teſtimony.

(45.) 1 John 5. 20. *We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an underſtanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jeſus Chriſt: This is the true God. Anſw.* This was a very negligent Tranſlation, ſay the *Socinians.* For whether you interpret *him that is true* to be God, or to be Chriſt, no ſenſe can be made of the Words. The latter part of the Text ought to have been thus rendred, *We are in him that is true* (*i. e.* in God) *by his Son Jeſus Chriſt. This is the true God*; *i. e.* He whoſe Son Chriſt is, and in whom we are, he and no other is the True God. So that this Text plainly denies that Chriſt is the True God. When we are ſaid to be *in* God *by* Chriſt; the meaning is, we are united to God (by his Love to us, and ours again to him) by the Procurement and Means of the Lord Chriſt, who hath by his Goſpel revealed God to us, and by the higheſt Arguments engaged us to love and ſerve him.

(46.) Rev. 1. 8. *I am Alpha and Omega, —ſaith the Lord, which is, and which was*, &c. *Anſw.* This Verſe ſpeaks of God only, not of Chriſt: for at *Ver.* 4, and 5, Chriſt is diſtin-

diſtinguiſhed from him, *which is, and which was.*

(47.) Rev. 1. 11. *I am Alpha and Omega, the firſt and the laſt.* *Anſw.* 1. This part of the Verſe is not in the Latin, nor in any good Greek Bible. 2. But admitting the Words, it has been ſaid on *Iſa.* 44. 6. in the Second Letter, in what Senſe theſe Terms may be uſed of the Lord Chriſt.

(48.) Rev. 1. 17. *I am the Firſt and the Laſt.* *Anſw.* See on *Iſa.* 44. 6.

(49.) Rev. 2. 23. *I am he, which ſearcheth the Reins and Heart.* Every one knows this is an Hebrew and Scripture Phraſe, ſignifying, *I know the moſt ſecret Thoughts,* which is a Property belonging only to God. *Anſw.* The Knowledg which the Lord Chriſt had or hath, of any ones ſecret Thoughts, is a Revelation made to him by God; as it was alſo ſometimes to former Prophets: Rev. 1. 1. *The Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, which God gave to him, to ſhew unto his Servants.* 2 Kings 6. 12. *The Prophet that is in* Iſrael, *telleth the King of* Iſrael, *the Words that thou ſpeakeſt in thy Bed-chamber.* 2 Kings 8. 12. *I know the Evil that thou wilt do to the Children of* Iſrael. Prophets ſearch the Heart, that is, know the Thoughts and Propenſions of the Heart, by the Spirit or Inſpiration of God in them. But the Lord Chriſt hath a far greater meaſure of that Spirit, than any of the former Prophets ever had.

(50.) Rev. 3. 14. *The Beginning of the Creation of God.* *Anſw.* 1. Theſe Words prove that Chriſt is not God, but a Creature. 2. But the Truth is, the Greek ſhould have been thus rendred, The Prince (or Chief) of the Creation of God.

(51.) Rev. 5. 5. *The Root of* David. *Anſw.* That is, a Root ſpringing from *David:* As a Root of the Earth, is a Root which ſpringeth from the Earth; not on the contrary, a Root from which the Earth ſpringeth.

(52.) Rev. 5. 6. *I beheld, in the midſt of the Throne —a Lamb* (as it had been ſlain) *having —ſeven Eyes, which are the ſeven Spirits of God, ſent forth into all the Earth.* *Anſw.* This Text confirms what has been often ſaid, namely, that the Knowledg which our Lord Chriſt now hath of Affairs on Earth, is (partly) by means of thoſe miniſtring Spirits which are ſent forth into all the Earth, *as his Eyes,* to ſee and relate the ſtate of things: for what other reaſon can they be here called his Eyes?

(53.) Rev. 5. 8. *Having every one of them, —Vials full of Odors, which are the Prayers of the Saints.* *Anſw.* In this Viſion the Prayers of the Saints are by the Elders (or Presbyters) offered to Chriſt, as the Mediator; that is, with Intention that he ſhould recommend them to God by his Interceſſion. But note alſo, that 'tis not here ſaid that theſe Prayers were at all offer'd to Chriſt. *Farther;* it appears that theſe Prayers were only Praiſes, not Petitions. See *ver.* 9, 10.

(54.) Rev. 17. 4. *Lord of Lords, and King of Kings.* *Anſw.* Chriſt is ſo Lord of Lords; as that himſelf hath one, who is not only his Lord, but his God. John 20. 17. *I aſcend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.*

(55.) Rev. 21. 6. *I am Alpha and Omega.* *Anſw.* Theſe Words are ſpoken by and of God only.

(56.) Rev. 22. 20. *Even ſo, come Lord Jeſus.* *Anſw.* 'Tis a Wiſh, not a Prayer.

(57.) Rev. 22. 21. *The Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt be with you.* *Anſw.* In what Senſe the Grace or Favour of Chriſt is *wiſhed* to Chriſtians, hath been explained on 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. and on 2 *Cor.* 13. 14.

Beſides theſe Anſwers to particular Texts, the *Socinians* ſay farther in general *to all the Quotations* out of the New Teſtament: That,

1. Whereas they differ from the Church in tranſlating *ſeveral,* and in interpreting *all* the before-cited Texts; their Tranſlations and Interpretations ought to be admitted, and thoſe of the Church, or *Trinitarians,* rejected; becauſe that Interpretation of Scripture can never be true, which holds forth either a Doctrine or a Conſequence that is abſurd, or contradictory and impoſſible. Is it not (ſay they) manifeſtly contradictory and impoſſible,

ble, that there ſhould be three Almighty and moſt wiſe Perſons, and yet but one God; when nothing can be more certain or evident, than that every Almighty and moſt wiſe Perſon is a God, a moſt perfect God, to whom nothing can be added? Is it not doubly contradictory and abſurd to ſay, there are three Perſons who are *ſeverally and each of them* the true and *moſt High God*, and yet there is but one true and moſt High God? Unleſs you mean one thing by *a true and moſt High God*, in the firſt Clauſe, and another thing in the other Clauſe: And if ſo, you introduce *two ſorts* of true and *moſt High* Gods; which I think all Chriſtians abhor.

We reject the Doctrine of the *Anthropomorphites* (that God hath Humane Parts and Paſſions) though grounded, if you regard only the ſound of the Words, on a great many clear Texts of Scripture, as may be ſeen in Mr. *Bidle*'s Catechiſm; *becauſe 'tis abſurd and impoſſible*, that he who has Humane Parts and Paſſions, and reſides in Heaven only, ſhould create and preſerve the World, and ſhould be conſcious to Mens Thoughts on Earth. What can be more expreſs than, *This is my Body?* yet we juſtly reject the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, *becauſe 'tis contradictory, and impoſſible*, that the ſame Body ſhould at the ſame time be in more places than one. Therefore any other Doctrine, that plainly appears to be abſurd and contradictory, ought alſo to be rejected; how agreeable ſoever it may ſeem to *the meer Chime and Jingle of the Words* of ſome few Texts. We are (as *Tertullian* rightly ſaith) to interpret Scripture, not by the Sound of Words, but the Nature of Things: *Malo* (ſaith the Father) *te ad ſenſum rei, quam ad ſonum vocabuli exercitus.* Tertul. *adv.* Prax. *c.* 3.

2. They ſay farther, That none of the objected and above-cited Texts, are by *Trinitarians* themſelves thought to be true and demonſtrative Proofs either of the Trinity, or of the Divinity of the Son or Spirit. Every one of theſe Texts, but *John* 1. 1, &c. is given up to the *Socinians*, as an incompetent and unconcluding Proof, by ſome or other of the moſt learned and allowed Criticks and Interpreters of *the Proteſtant Party*. And *John* 1. 1, &c. is given up by *Epiſcopius*; who ſays, that the Socinian Interpretation of that Context is, *Bona & Vera*, a true and good Interpretation. As to the *Catholick* Doctors (ſo called) *Chr. Sandius* hath made a great Collection of Teſtimonies out of them, to this effect, That neither the Trinity, nor the Divinity of the Lord Chriſt, or of the Holy Spirit, can be proved by the Scripture; but by Tradition only. Some of them confeſs that the Scriptures rather favour the Socinian Doctrine; and that the Trinity is not only above, but contrary to Reaſon; finally that if the Authority of the Church did not oblige them to be Catholicks, they ſhould chooſe to be *Socinians*. See for theſe things: *Sandius, Hiſt. Eccl.* l. 1. *c. de Ario* and *Cingallus, in Script. Trin. Revel.* An Engliſh Author of the Romiſh Perſwaſion, has theſe Words (*in Fiat. Lux.* p. 379, 380.) I may truly ſay, *Chriſt is the Pope's God.* For if the Pope had not been, or had not been ſo *vigilant and reſolute* a Paſtor as he is; (he means *ſuch a Perſecutor*) Chriſt whom the Pope both worſhips himſelf, and propounds to the World to worſhip *as the very true God, that made all things*, Chriſt I ſay had not been taken for any ſuch Perſon, as this day we believe him to be.

Whereas beſides the above-cited Texts, the Orthodox object, That if Chriſt were not God as well as Man, he could not ſatisfy the Juſtice of God for our Sins, or be a full and ſufficient Atonement for them: The *Socinians* anſwer, 1. That the Lord Chriſt is a Propitiation and Atonement for Sin, is a Demonſtration that he is not God, for God doth not give or make, but receive the Satisfaction for our Sins. 2. They wonder that the Son of God, though he is a Man only, ſhould not be judged a ſufficient Satisfaction and Propitiation for Sin, (through the gracious Acceptance of God) when 'tis ſo known and evident, that the Oblation and Sacrifice of *Beaſts* under the Moſaic Law, and from *Adam* till thoſe times, was accepted as a full Atone-

ment and Satisfaction *in order to Forgiveness*; Lev. 6. 6. *He shall bring his Trespass-Offering, a Ram without Blemish*; —— *and the Priest shall make Atonement for him before the Lord, for any thing of all that he hath done in trespassing.* See the whole Context.

Finally, Whereas the Orthodox do decline many of the Socinian Arguments, by the Distinction of two Natures (a Divine and Humane Nature) in Christ: For Example; When the *Socinians* object, *John* 14. 28. *My Father is greater than I:* or, *John* 5. 30. *I can do nothing of my self.* We answer, That those things are spoken of Christ only according to his humane Nature; but that he hath also a Divine Nature, by which he is equal to the Father, and can do all things of himself. To this they reply, 1. That the Distinction of two Natures (a Divine and Humane) in Christ, is clearly overthrown by the 8th, 9th, 10th and 11th Arguments mentioned in the first Letter. 2. If a thing otherways true of Christ, may be denied of him, because 'tis only in one of these (pretended) Natures, and not in the other; if our Saviour, saith he, can do nothing of himself, only because he can do nothing of himself according to his humane Nature, and can do all things of himself according to his (pretended) Divine Nature; then 'tis lawful and allowable to say, Christ is no Man, was never born of the Virgin, was not crucified, dead, or buried, did not rise again from the dead, ascended not into Heaven, under pretence that according to his Divine Nature, he never was born of the Virgin, never was crucified, dead, or buried, *&c.* Now who does not see, that to speak thus, were to deny the whole New Testament, and renounce Christianity? Have not we (say the *Socinians*) reason to reject and abhor a Distinction, that if it incommodes our Doctrine, and the Allegations for it, does as effectually fight against the most evident and acknowledg'd Points of the Christian Faith? Nay the Distinction and Evasions founded on it, do at least as much hurt to the *Trinitarians* as to the *Socinians*. For if the Distinction of two Natures be true; and the Answers founded on it allowable; then no fault can be found with a *Socinian*, when he shall say, Christ is not true God, was not generated of the Essence of the Father, was not from Eternity: for all this may be said of him *according* (to use their own Words) *his humane Nature*; for according to that, he is not true God, was not generated of the Father's Essence, was not from Eternity. Do not *Trinitarians* absolutely disallow, as false and heretical, these Forms of Speech, though defended by the Distinction of the two Natures? why then do they expect, that their Adversaries in this Controversy, should admit their Answers which are founded on the same, and no other Defence?

This, Sir, is the Sum of what these Gentlemen say on this great Question; a Brief of their Arguments and Answers, by which they would support their Doctrine, that God is but one Person; and that (as some of them add) our Lord Christ nor the Holy Spirit, neither are, *nor ever are called Gods or God* in Holy Scripture, as also that neither Creation (whether New or Old) nor any of the Attributes of God are ascribed to our Blessed Saviour. For a Conclusion, give me leave to advise you in the Words of St. *Paul*, 1 Thess. 5. 21. *Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.*

SIR,

I am Your

most Obliged.

The

The Publiſher to whom the foregoing Letters were written, having left them ſome time with a Gentleman, a Perſon of excellent Learning and Worth; they were returned to him with this following Letter.

SIR,

HAving had the Favour of peruſing theſe Letters, I cannot but greatly eſteem the Learning and Judgment of the Author; who has brought ſo large a Controverſy (and that has been debated with the utmoſt Induſtry, Learning, and Subtilty for many hundred Years, even from ſoon after the time of the Apoſtles) into ſo ſo ſmall a Compaſs, that one may ſoon ſee the Allegations from Scripture on both ſides, with the moſt material Diſtinctions and Anſwers. Wherein it ſeems obvious to me, what is ſaid in one of the Paragraphs of the Firſt Letter, that the *Unitarian* Doctrine is an accountable and reaſonable Faith, grounded on clear and evident Scripture-Arguments, ſo far as a negative Propoſition can reaſonably be expected to be: Whereas the *Trinitarian* Doctrine is founded upon obſcure or miſtaken Texts; and defended by ſuch unreaſonable Diſtinctions, as cannot be admitted by any Man of a free Judgment, being either contradictory in themſelves, or utterly unintelligible. However, I can do no leſs than conclude, and expect every judicious Man's Aſſent to it; 1. That the Doctrine of the *Trinitarians* is no neceſſary or fundamental Doctrine of Chriſtianity. 2. That 'tis unjuſt and unchriſtian, to lay the *Unitarians* or *Socinians* under any Penalties or Forfeitures, upon the account of their Doctrine. 3. That *Trinitarians* ought to own the *Unitarians* for Chriſtian Brethren, and behave themſelves towards them as ſuch.

Firſt, I ſaid the Doctrine of the *Trinitarians* is no neceſſary or fundamental Doctrine of Chriſtianity. For to ſay it is, doth, 1. Reflect upon the Goodneſs of God, and his Love to Mankind: as making that fundamental and neceſſary to Salvation, the Truth whereof muſt be confeſſed to be ſo very obſcure and uncertain, that where the Prejudices of Education, Reſpect of Men, and Fear of Penalties do not prevail, the vulgar (who are ten to one of Mankind) either do not believe it at all, or confeſs it, as Parrots ſpeak Words, without Underſtanding. 2. To make the Doctrine of the *Trinity* fundamental, is to join Hands with Papiſts in contradiction to Proteſtant Doctrine; owning with them that the Scriptures are obſcure and unſufficient even in Fundamentals: and ſo bringing in a neceſſity of admitting and believing unſcriptural Traditions. Of this the Papiſts are ſo ſenſible, that it is the chief of thoſe Arguments with which they attack Proteſtants; and which they urge in their former and latter Writings: wherein they not only ſeem to have, but have in reality great Advantage; as will (I am perſwaded) appear to thoſe that impartially conſider it. It will not be here impertinent to tell you a Story that hapned in the preſent Reign. A certain great Lord was aſſaulted in his Faith by a Jeſuit or other Seminary, who began with him thus; *My Lord, I know you believe the Creed of Athanaſius:* to which the Lord (wiſely perceiving what he would build upon that Conceſſion) an-

ſwer'd, *Who told you ſo?* which quick Anſwer by Queſtion, did ſo ſurprize and diſappoint the Seminary, that he had no more to ſay. It ſeems his intended Argument leaned on that Pillar alone, to wit, the Belief of the Creed commonly called the *Athanaſian*. 3. The *Trinitarian* Doctrine reflects Weakneſs and Unſufficiency upon the whole Chriſtian Church and Faith of the Firſt Ages; which (as our Author has noted) knew or profeſſed no other but the Apoſtles Creed, which doth fully agree with the *Unitarian* or *Socinian*, but by no means with the *Trinitarian* Doctrine of fundamental Faith. 4. They that urge the Doctrine of the Trinity *as fundamental*, do clearly impugn the Sixth Article of the Church of *England*, which ſaith, " Holy " Scripture containeth all things neceſſary to " Salvation: So that whatſoever is not read " therein, nor may be proved thereby, is " not to be required of any Man, that it " ſhould be believed as an Article of the " Faith. Such alſo was the Judgment of Mr. *Chillingworth*, that eminent Defender of Proteſtantiſm, *ch. 6. n. 56.* where he ſaith, " By the Religion of Proteſtants, I under- " ſtand—that wherein they all agree;—*THE* " *BIBLE*, *THE BIBLE*, I ſay, *THE BIBLE* " only is the Religion of Proteſtants. " Whatever elſe they believe beſides it, and " the *plain irrefragable and indubitable* Conſe- " quences of it, well may they hold it as a " matter of Opinion, but not as a matter of " Faith or Religion: neither can they with " Conſiſtence to their own Grounds, believe " it themſelves; nor require the Belief of it " from others, without moſt high and moſt " ſciſmatical Preſumption.

Secondly, I ſaid, it follows from the foregoing Diſcourſes, that it is unjuſt and unchriſtian, to lay the *Unitarians* or *Socinians* under any Penal Laws or other Hardſhips, on the account of their Conſcience and Doctrine. For we may ſee here, that an honeſt and ſincere Man, may in the Purſuit of his own Salvation, and in adhering to Proteſtant Principles, of the Clearneſs and Sufficiency of Scripture in Fundamentals, as alſo in reverence of the ancient Faith held forth in the Apoſtolick Creed, and of the Church of the Firſt Ages, he may (I ſay) with clear Satisfaction in his own Conſcience, disbelieve the *Trinitarian* Doctrine. But how can Chriſtians with Satisfaction to their Conſciences puniſh ſuch a Man? As for the publick Peace, there is not only nothing in the Nature of their Doctrine that inclines them to Unpeaceableneſs; but they have alſo always been extremely candid to thoſe that differ from them, from a Principle common (I think) to them and the Remonſtrants only, that *Conſcience ought to be free in Matters of Faith:* This is a Principle with the *Socinians* and the Remonſtrants; other Families of Chriſtians take it up as an Expedient, when they have need of it. Briefly, If the *Socinians* appear to be as careful and diligent to know the Truth, as *Athanaſians*; if they are in their Stations as learned as they, and as innocent and vertuous Men in their Converſations; how can any Chriſtian judg and condemn them, without incurring our Saviour's Judgment and Condemnation? He that believes the whole Bible heartily; and endeavours ſincerely to know the Mind of God and Chriſt therein, and to purge himſelf from thoſe carnal Affections and Worldly Intereſts that hinder Men from ſeeing and obeying the Truth; and (perhaps) as a Teſtimony thereof, ſuffers the Loſs of Advantages, and Goods, Kinſfolk, and Country, nay, undergoes Penury and other Hardſhips in foreign Countries, as many do at this Day; How can any who pretend to give Obedience to the Law of Common Reaſon, of *Moſes* and the Prophets, and of Chriſt himſelf in his Sermon on the Mount, to wit, of doing to others as we would they ſhould do to us, how, I ſay, can ſuch think a *Socinian* ſo qualified as we have but now deſcribed him, doth deſerve Puniſhment for his Faith? And how can any Man, without tranſgreſſing Chriſt's Law of Charity, judge ſuch a one to be guilty, without any appearance of Guilt, more than may be eaſily ſeen in himſelf? Is it not the common Principle of all Proteſtants, to believe the Holy Scriptures are ſufficient to all Religion, and clear in all Neceſ-

ſaries

ſaries of Faith and Manners, and that every Man is obliged by our Lord Chriſt, to believe and practiſe according to his own Knowledg, Light and Underſtanding of the Scriptures? He that does ſo, is not only a Chriſtian, but a Proteſtant, that is, a Reformed Chriſtian. *I am fully aſſured* (ſays Mr. *Chillingworth*, and conſequently thoſe learned Perſons, the Vice-Chancellor of *Oxford*, the Regius Profeſſor, and others who licenſed and approved his Book) *that God does not, and therefore Men ought not, require more of any Man than this, to believe the Scripture to be God's Word, to endeavour to find the true Senſe of it, and to live according to it*, ch. 6. n. 56. The ſame Author ſays (*ch.* 5. *n.* 96.) *I have learnt from the ancient Fathers, that nothing is more againſt Religion, than to force Religion: and of St.* Paul, *that the Weapons of the Chriſtian Warfare are not carnal.* The Famous *Salvian* of *Marſeils* (who wrote about the Year of our Lord 460.) ſaith thus concerning one ſort of *Unitarians*, viz. *Arians*, *They are Hereticks, but not knowingly: ——They do ſo much judg themſelves Catholicks, that they defame us with the Name of Hereticks: ——They err, but with a good Mind; not of Hatred, but of the Love of God.——How they ſhall be puniſh'd in the Day of Judgment for this Error of a falſe Opinion, none can know but the Judg. De Gubern. Dei. l.* 5. where may be read more to the ſame purpoſe. Though this Author, according to the Vogue of Thoſe Times, called the *Arians* Hereticks; yet that which he ſays farther of them, ſhows they were not ſo: for the Character he gives of them, ſhews them to be conſcientious Chriſtians; and Lovers of God. St. *Auſtin* againſt the *Manichees* (a ſort of People that held there were two Gods, one Good, the other Evil) ſaith thus, *Let them be fierce againſt you, who know not how laborious a thing it is to find out the Truth; and how difficultly we eſcape Errors: Let them be fierce againſt you, who know not how rare and hard a thing it is to overcome carnal Imaginations by the Serenity of a Pious Mind*, &c. *Contr. Ep. Fauſti.*

Thirdly, I added, that the *Trinitarians* ought to own the *Unitarians* for Chriſtian Brethren, and to behave themſelves towards them as ſuch. For Proteſtants do agree, that all neceſſary and fundamental Matters of Faith are clear and plain in Scripture; but other Matters not ſo evident but that good Chriſtians may err concerning them, as we ſee they did even in the times of the Apoſtles. Now this Doctrine of the *Trinitarians* appearing to be no fundamental Doctrine, it does by no means unchriſtian thoſe that hold the contrary, nor excuſe the *Trinitarians* from thoſe Offices, which are due to them as Chriſtians. And the rather, becauſe they are not only willing to make Confeſſion of Faith in all the forms of Words contained in the Holy Scripture, but in the Words alſo of the Apoſtles Creed; as alſo becauſe they are not liable to any charge of Idolatry, or Superſtition in their Worſhip; or of Uncharitableneſs in condemning thoſe of contrary Minds, as the Confederacy of *Rome* is.

Therefore I cannot but wonder at ſome learned Men, that are ſo far carried away with an overweaning Opinion of their own Judgment, that they will not allow thoſe the name of Chriſtians who do not believe, beſides the Bible, and the Creed of the Apoſtles, alſo the Nicene and Athanaſian Creeds: Nay, ſome account the Trinitarian Doctrines to be ſo neceſſary to Chriſtianity, that *though thoſe who deny them be otherways very pious and uſeful Men, yet going againſt the ſenſe of the Catholick Church, they err, not for want of Inſtruction, but from a certain Wantonneſs and Pride of Underſtanding, and are guilty of ſuch unpardonable Immodeſty as admits of no Excuſe.* If what is hinted in theſe Letters, concerning the Catholick Church of the Apoſtles Times and firſt Ages, be true; then that Author builds his Condemnation upon a falſe and rotten Foundation, and the Building falling, impreſſes Raſhneſs, and Uncharitableneſs upon himſelf; I mean as to this particular Caſe, for otherways I readily acknowledg the Worth and Learning of the Author.

Neither can I ſufficiently admire, that another learned Man, and a Sufferer for his Conſcience, ſhould in a *Pacifick Diſcourſe* treat the

the *Socinians* in the ſame contumelious Manner, not allowing them worthy of the Name of Chriſtians, becauſe *they go about* (ſaith he) *to overthrow the whole frame of the Chriſtian Doctrine, by arrogant Preſumptions of falſe Reaſonings and Sophiſtical Arguments.* Yea, it is commonly objected againſt them, that they exalt their Reaſonings above plain and expreſs Revelation in Scripture. Which Crimination ſeems to me, to be clearly taken away by the four Letters, in which it appears, by the many unconcluding Texts, falſe Tranſlations, unintelligible Reaſonings and Diſtinctions, cited and urged on the behalf of the *Trinitarian* Doctrine; and on the other hand, by the numerous clear Texts, allowed Tranſlations, Reaſonings and Diſtinctions, common to Mankind, produced by the *Unitarians*; that theſe laſt may reaſonably retort this great Objection, on their Oppoſites the *Trinitarians*, who in a thouſand expreſs Texts of Scripture do exalt their Reaſonings to maintain another ſenſe than the plain Words require. For one Inſtance, how many expreſs Texts aſcribe Parts and Members, Affections and Paſſions, Shape and Figure, Place and Circumſcription to God? all which (as the Author of theſe Letters notes) are otherways expounded by Learned Men, becauſe they judg theſe things in Reaſon unſuitable to God. But what Principle more clear both in Reaſon and Scripture than this, that there is but one God, or that God is one? All Chriſtians, and all *Jews*, and all *Mahometans* (who are ſaid to be more in Number than Chriſtians) beſides the wiſe Heathens, do acknowledg it; and all theſe underſtand by the term *God*, a neceſſary exiſtent Perſon. Upon theſe clear Grounds the *Unitarians* deny that there are three ſuch, as contrary to that Unity; and introducing into the Godhead two unneceſſary or ſuperfluous Perſons. For if one be ſufficient, and he cannot be God if he be not ſufficient, then the two more are ſupernumerary and unneceſſary, and conſequently not God. For my own part, I was bred up in the *Trinitarian* Faith, and took the Truth of it for granted; but when theſe Scriptures and Reaſons came into my View, (and I had got over the Fear of examining, what ſome Men who name themſelves the Church, call Fundamentals) I could not avoid the Force of them: though it grieves me that I cannot continue in conſent with my old Friends, as well in this as other parts of Chriſtian Doctrine. But certainly as in Philoſophy, Truth ſhould be more dear to us than *Plato* or *Socrates*; ſo in Theology, *the Teſtimony of plain Scripture agreeing with evident Reaſon, ſhould prevail with thoſe who believe the Scriptures Divine, more than obſcure Texts diſſonant to the clear Reaſon of Mankind.* And it may well allay any ones Fear of examining and judging concerning (pretended) Fundamentals, when he ſhall conſider that even the Church of *England* in another of her Articles ſays, that *as the Church of* Jeruſalem, Alexandria, *and* Antioch *have erred, ſo alſo the Church of* Rome (which contends that ſhe is the Catholick Church) *hath erred, not only in her living and manner of Ceremonies, but alſo in matter of Faith.* So alſo *Chillingworth* (with his Approvers) ſays, *I ſee plainly and with mine own Eyes, that there are Popes againſt Popes, Councils againſt Councils; ſome Fathers againſt others, the ſame Fathers againſt themſelves; a conſent of Fathers of one Age, againſt a conſent of Fathers of another.* ——— *There is no ſufficient Certainty but in the Scripture only, for any conſidering Man to build upon.* As to the boaſt of their Numbers, 'tis well known there was a time when the Chriſtian World was *Arian*, that is *Unitarian*; ſo that the Council of *Ariminum* and *Seleucia* in which 560 Biſhops were preſent (the greateſt Convention of Biſhops that ever was) decreed for the *Unitarian* Faith. Was Number in thoſe times an Argument of Truth? If not, how can it be ſo now?

The Author of theſe Letters has well obſerved beſides, that the Doctrine of the *Trinitarians* in theſe Days, is widely different from the Doctrine decreed in the firſt Council of *Nice*; from whence I infer, that their Boaſt of Antiquity is as vain as the

the other of Number. I will only add to this Obſervation, that though the more Ancient and the Modern *Trinitarians* may agree in Terms, yet thoſe Times and theſe have different Senſes of the ſame Words and Phraſes.

SIR, I pray accept of my hearty Thanks for this Publication, and ſhew the Author how great an Honour I have for him.

I am,

Yours, *&c.*

FINIS.

A

DEFENCE

OF THE

Brief HISTORY

OF THE

UNITARIANS,

Againſt

Dr. SHERLOCK's ANSWER

IN HIS

VINDICATION

OF THE

Holy Trinity.

LONDON:

Printed in the Year, M.DC.XCI.

OBSERVATIONS On Dr. SHERLOCK's ANSWER TO THE Brief HISTORY OF THE UNITARIANS.

CHAP. I.

Containing ſome General Obſervations.

WHen I ſee Men arguing againſt the Trinity; methinks I hear a Papiſt inveighing againſt *Luther* or *Calvin*, for queſtioning the Truth of Tranſubſtantiation. Indeed it appears to me very ſtrange, that Proteſtants ſhould ſtand to *the Principles of the Reformation*, only when they ſerve their turn; and that they ſhould be ready to part with them, when they are not otherways able to defend a particular Opinion. It cannot be denied, that the Chriſtian Church in ſucceeding Ages fell ſhort of her firſt Purity, in reſpect of Doctrine as well as Manners. Now what other Remedy could be applied to ſuch a Depravation, than a ſincere and careful Examination of the Points ſuſpected of Falſhood, according to Reaſon and Scripture? This proved ſo effectual a Courſe; that Tranſubſtantiation, and ſome other Canonized Opinions were found to be meer Human Inventions, and accordingly were rejected as contrary to the two above-mentioned Rules. And who can aſſure us, that the Reformation left no Error behind; and that the Trinity is ſuch an Opinion, as ought neither to be doubted of, nor to be reformed? Shall we truſt Men, barely on their Word? Or was it impoſſible that the Trinity ſhould creep into the Church, as well as ſeveral other falſe Opinions? Our Principles therefore allow us to examine it; and to inquire, whether it be founded on undeniable Arguments: eſpecially being of ſuch a nature that it contradicts Reaſon; and by confeſſion of all Trinitarians, is no where ſet down in Holy Scripture *in expreſs Words*. Why ſhould Men call us Hereticks and Libertines, becauſe we inquire after Truth; and will have our Faith built upon a ſolid Foundation? Was the Reformation ſo proper to *Luther* and *Calvin*, *&c.* that it ought no more to be thought of? Or were thoſe Reformers ſo infallible, that they purged the Church from all Errors? This I think would be an hard matter to prove. Let therefore no Proteſtant be ſcandalized; if having ſome Scruples about the Trinity, we endeavour to free our ſelves from them, by a ſincere inquiry into the Grounds of it.

I begin with *Reason*; and find that the belief of a Trinity does contradict it, as much as Transubstantiation. According to Transubstantiation, the same Numerical Body may be in a Million of different places at the same time. According to the Trinity, three Divine Persons, that is to say, three Intelligent Infinite Beings, each of which is God, make but one God. I cannot believe the First; because Reason teaches me, that one Numerical Body can oocupy or be in but one place at one time. I cannot believe the other; because Reason tells me, that Three are Three, and not One: and that it implies no less a Contradiction, that Three Divine Persons should be but One God; than that one Body be a Million. Now who should not scruple an Opinion, perfectly parallel with Transubstantiation; and equally fruitful in Incongruities and Contradictions?

I come in the second place to examine; Whether the Trinity be well grounded *in Scripture?* Indeed *Three* are there mentioned; *the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost:* but how came Men to fancy, that they Three are but One God? Who taught 'em so? Does the Holy Scripture plainly say; that *there is but one God, yet there are Three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the Godhead?* One would think indeed, that such a Mystery, and so necessary in order to Salvation, were set down in Scripture in plain or express Words. But the Scripture is perfectly silent about it: there is not a Word to be found in the Bible, of *Three Hypostases or Persons in the Godhead.* The Father is in a thousand places called *God*, distinctly from the Son; nay *the only true God.* The Holy Ghost is no where stiled *God.* And the Son is so called in a few places, as it were by the way, and in such manner as plainly shows, that the Title [*God*] is bestowed on him, upon the same account as upon *Moses*, even because of the Dignity and Power, to which he was exalted by the Father's Liberality. Indeed it can have no other meaning. The Holy Scripture teaches us, that there is but one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. But if so; How can the Son be that one God, the Father? Of this we are sure, by the whole tenor of the Gospel, that Christ was a Man. The Gospel is nothing else but the History of Christ's Birth, Life, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension into Heaven. Who would have thought, that a Man should be accounted the Supream God, without any such intimation from Scripture, nay against the whole current of it? We find in the Gospel, that there is one God, the Father of our Lord Christ; one Son of God, sent into the World to be the Revealer of his Father's Will, and a Mediator between God and Man, even Christ; and one Holy Ghost, who distributes and works all sorts of Miraculous Gifts, for the confirmation of the Gospel. The Father of Christ is the One true God; Christ is only his Minister and Interpreter; the Holy Ghost (whether it be God's Power, or his ministring Angel, or Angels) the Instrument which he makes use of to work Miracles. None certainly but Men blinded or prejudiced could think, that God's Minister and Ambassador were God himself; and that two so opposite Beings as God and Christ, should be one and the same Thing. It is just as if one should say, there is one King *William*; and one Vice-Roy in *Ireland*, the Lord *Sidney*; and the Vice-Roy is that one King *William.* Indeed this is a Doctrine so unreasonable and contradictious, and so opposite to Holy Scripture; that I think, had there been no such thing as Platonick Philosophy, the Trinity should never have been heard of. I desire therefore the *Trinitarians*, to abate a little of their Confidence: Let them examine with an unprejudiced Mind, upon what Foundations they build the belief of a Trinity; and they will soon perceive how weak and frail it is. Let them at last confess, that the Scripture does not threaren eternal Damnation to those who disbelieve a Trinity: And then, if themselves won't part with their darling Opinion; let them abstain from persecuting others.

Thirdly. Trinitarians lay so much stress upon *the Tradition of the Church* concerning the Trinity, that I think it worth while to undeceive

undeceive them; by ſhewing, that there never was ſo great a Variation in the Church, as about this Point. I ſhall divide into three Periods all the Ages of the Church. The Firſt reaches to the Council of *Nice*: The Second from the Council of *Nice*, to the Schoolmen: And the Third from the Schoolmen, to our time.

And one that is never ſo little acquainted with the Writings of the Fathers of the three firſt Centuries, cannot deny, if he be but ſincere; that thoſe Fathers follow the *Ideas* of *Plato* concerning the three Principles, and therefore ſpeak rather like *Arians* than *Orthodox*. They tell us, that the Son and Holy Ghoſt have each of them his own Nature and Eſſence, whereby they are diſtinguiſh'd from each other; and that the Son is ſubordinate and inferior to the Father, both in Nature and Power; as likewiſe the Holy Ghoſt is ſubordinate to the Son. If any one deſires to ſee ſome undeniable Proofs of what I aſſert, I refer him to the *Quaternio* of *Curcellæus*, whereby he will be fully ſatisfied.

The ſucceeding Fathers finding fault with this Notion, brought into the World a new Interpretation of the three Principles. They won't have them to be ſubordinate, but equal both in Nature and Power. However they acknowledg them to be three Eſſences, or Collateral Beings. If you ask them, how they can avoid admitting a Plurality of Gods? They will anſwer, That thoſe three Beings are but one God, as *Peter*, *James* and *John*, are but one Man. If you deny that *Peter*, *James* and *John*, are but one Man; they will tell you, that you are miſtaken; becauſe in Propriety of Speech, this term *Man* ought not to ſignify an Individual, as *Peter*, or *James*, or *John*; but a ſpecifical Nature common to them all; ſo that thô they be three Individuals, or three Perſons; yet they are but one Man, being Partakers of the ſame ſpecifical common Nature. This they apply to their three Principles: They are indeed (ſay they) three Hypoſtaſes or Perſons, yet they are but one God: This term *God* denoting not an Individual Hypoſtaſis, but a Nature common to the three Perſons of the Trinity, whereby thô they are three, yet they are ſaid to be but one God. Thus they made ſhift, as well as they could. It was indeed a very unſufficient way of explaining the Unity of God, and did by no means reſolve the difficulty. They made an abſtract ſpecifical God, (*as the Heathens might equally have done*) but there were ſtill three Individual or Numerical Gods; as *Peter*, *James* and *John*, may be ſaid to be by Abſtraction one ſpecifical Man, becauſe they have the ſame ſpecifical Nature; but however they are ſtill three Individual Numerical Men.

Therefore the Schoolmen diſliking this Notion, as favouring Polytheiſm, found out a new one more agreeable (as they thought) to the Unity of God. They won't have the three Perſons of the Trinity to have each of them his own Eſſence and Nature. No, this too plainly deſtroys the Unity of God. There is, ſay they, but one Divine Eſſence. Right! but then they muſt not part with three Perſons of the Trinity: Therefore, what are thoſe three Perſons? They are Three Subſiſtences; Three Modes; Three Relations; Three I know not whats. This is meer Nonſenſe: for a Perſon is an Intelligent Being, and Three Perſons muſt needs be Three Intelligent Beings. So true it is, that whoſoever acknowledges Three Perſons in the Godhead (if he takes the Word in its proper ſenſe) muſt admit Three Gods: Which the Learned Doctor cannot avoid, who ſays they are *Three diſtinct Minds*, *Three ſubſtantial Beings*, *Three intelligent Beings*; therefore unavoidably Three Gods.

Now is it fair to boaſt ſo much of the Tradition concerning the Trinity, as if it had been conſtant and unalterable in all the Ages of the Church, when the contrary appears to any ſincere Reader? The Fathers who lived before the Council of *Nice*, ſpeak, like *Platonic Philoſophers* and *Arians*; the Nicene Fathers like *Tritheiſts*; and the School-men like *Mad-men*. Where

now.

now is that unchangeable Tradition, ſo much cried up? Conſidering the ridiculouſneſs of thoſe Men, who in their reſpective Ages ſet up new Notions of the Trinity; I am apt to ſay, contrary to *Averroes* his Wiſh, *Let not my Soul be with the Philoſophers.* To conclude this Chapter, thoſe great Boaſters of the (pretended) Tradition, ſhould do well to apply themſelves to the confuting the *Quaternio* of *Curcellæus* before mentioned; which when they have fully and truly performed, we may perhaps begin to think of parting with Tradition, which indeed is not the Foundation whereon we build our Faith, *Knowing* only *the Scriptures which are able to make wiſe unto Salvation.*

CHAP. II.

Containing an Examination of the Doctor's Anſwers, to the Arguments againſt the Trinity in the Hiſtory of the Unitarians.

HAving premiſed this general Obſervation; I come to examine, what Anſwer the Doctor returns to the Arguments alledged againſt the Trinity, by the Author of *the Brief Hiſtory of the Unitarians.*

But I muſt firſt conſider his Reflections, concerning the uſe of Reaſon in expounding Scripture. 'This is (ſaith he) an Impudent Argument, which brings Revelation 'down in ſuch ſublime Myſteries to the 'level of our Underſtandings, to ſay, ſuch a 'Doctrine cannot be contained in Scripture, 'becauſe it implies a Contradiction; whereas a modeſt Man would firſt inquire, whether it be in Scripture or not; and if it be 'plainly contained there, he would conclude, 'how *Unintelligible* ſoever it appeared to 'him, that yet there is no Contradiction in 'it, becauſe it is taught in Scripture. *p.* 141.

But is this Impudence, to ſay, Tranſubſtantiation cannot be contained in Scripture, becauſe it implies a Contradiction? I hope not. Well then, if the Trinity implies no leſs Contradiction than Tranſubſtantiation; why can't we ſay, that it cannot be contained in Scripture? We ſay, Tranſubſtantiation cannot be found in Scripture, becauſe it is a plain Contradiction to our Reaſon; but if the Trinity be alſo a plain Contradiction to our Reaſon; why ſhan't we be allowed to ſay, that it cannot be contained in Scripture? I think both Conſequences are right. But ſaith the Author, *A modeſt Man would firſt inquire whether it be in Scripture or not?* But we have already made ſuch an Inquiry, and cannot find the Trinity in Scripture. We never could read there, that *there are Three Perſons in one Numerical God.* Indeed, how could we? We might as well find there, that *the Bread of the Sacrament is Tranſubſtantiated into Chriſt's Body.* But he goes on; 'And if it be plainly contained there, he 'ſhould conclude, *how Unintelligible* ſoever 'it appeared to him, that yet there is no 'Contradiction in it, becauſe it is taught in 'Scripture. I beg the Author's pardon; there is a vaſt difference, between *Unintelligible* and *Contradictious.* He ſhould not have ſaid, How Unintelligible ſoever, but how Contradictious ſoever: And thus his Words ought to run; 'He ſhould conclude, how '*Contradictious ſoever* it appeared to him, 'that yet there is *no Contradiction* in it, be'cauſe it is taught by Scripture.

I perceive, the Author found it too harſh to ſay that, how Contradictious ſoever a thing appears to be, that yet there is no Contradiction in it, becauſe it is taught by Scripture;

Scripture; and therefore he puts the word *Unintelligible*, inſtead of the word *Contradictious*. In effect, we do not ſay, that every Unintelligible Thing contained in Scripture, is a Contradiction. We acknowledg, the Reſurrection plainly ſet down in Scripture, does imply no Contradiction, how Unintelligible ſoever it be; becauſe we do very clearly conceive, that God is able to raiſe our dead Bodies. We don't apprehend the manner of this Reſurrection; how it ſhall be performed, is a thing Unintelligible to us; but however 'tis altogether free from a Contradiction. Were the Trinity as clearly ſet down in Scripture, and as free from Contradiction; we would not diſbelieve it, how Unintelligible ſoever it appeared to us, no more than we diſbelieve the Reſurrection. But the Trinity being not only Unintelligible, but Contradictious; we deny it is taught in Scripture, which is altogether free from Contradiction.

Let us hear the Author a little farther; 'We muſt not indeed (ſaith he) expound 'Scripture contrary to common Senſe, and 'to the common Reaſon of Mankind, in 'ſuch Matters as every Man knows, and e'very Man can judge of; but in Matters of 'pure Revelation, which we have no na'tural Idea of, and know nothing of them 'but what is revealed; we muſt not pre'tend ſome imaginary Contradictions, to 'reject *the plain and expreſs* Authority of Re'velation. For 'tis impoſſible to know, 'what is a Contradiction to the Nature of 'Things, whoſe Natures we do not under'ſtand. *We muſt not indeed expound Scripture, contrary to common Senſe, and the common Reaſon of Mankind, in ſuch Matters as every Man knows and every Man can judge of.* I grant it; but what if the Trinity doth contradict *the common Reaſon of Mankind*; and is of ſuch a Nature *as every Man knows, and every Man can judge of?* Then certainly it cannot be contained in Scripture, according to this Author himſelf. Indeed we cannot fathom the Eſſence of an infinite Being, no more than (as this Author ſaith) the Eſſence of any created Being; yet as we have a diſtinct knowledg of ſome Properties of a Finite Being, ſo we have a clear Apprehenſion of the Attributes of God. We cannot be miſtaken in the Notion of *One* and *Three*; we are moſt certain, that One is not Three, and that Three are not One. The moſt ſimple Men have a clear Apprehenſion of thoſe two Numbers, and therefore are able to judge of them. Now the Scripture plainly tells us, that there is but One God; and every one knows that *One God is One Intelligent Infinite Perſon*, and therefore cannot be Three ſuch Perſons. He that has an Idea of *One*, and an Idea of *Three*, muſt needs perceive that it implies a Contradiction, that One be Three, and Three One; that one God be Three Intelligent Infinite Perſons or Beings, and Three Intelligent Infinite Beings One God; This every one can judge of. *Therefore we muſt not expound Scripture* (ſaith the Author) *contrary to common Senſe, and the common Reaſon of Mankind; in ſuch Matters as every Man knows, and every Man can judge of:* Therefore (ſay I) all being capable of judging, whether *One* may be *Three*, and *Three One*; and finding it a plain Contradiction to the common Reaſon of Mankind; all may be aſſured, that it cannot be contained in Scripture.

'But (ſaith the Author) in Matters of 'pure Revelation, which we have no na'tural Idea of, and know nothing of 'em 'but what is revealed; we muſt not pre'tend ſome imaginary Contradictions, to 'reject *the plain and expreſs* Authority of 'Scripture and Revelation; for it is im'poſſible to know, what is a Contradiction 'to the Natures of Things, whoſe Natures 'we do not underſtand. Now what does the Author mean by *the plain and expreſs* Authority of Revelation? Does he mean, that he has found ſomewhere in Scripture in *plain and expreſs* Words, that *there are Three Perſons in one Divine Nature or Godhead?* If it be ſo, let him ſhew us it. I doubt he calls *plain and expreſs Authority*, ſome falſe *Conſequences*, which he is pleaſed to draw from

Scripture,

Scripture, and which none but prejudiced Men would ever think of.

I wish we could shew a *Chinese*, the Gospel well translated into his own Language; and ask him, after a serious reading of it, what he thought Christ to be? It is very likely, I think, that he would not take him to be the supream God; and if any Man should tell him, he had overseen so great a Mystery; he would undoubtedly answer, that he is sure there is no such thing in the Gospel which he read, unless there be another Gospel wherein such a Notion is contained. I confess there are some Matters of Revelation, which we have no natural Idea of; and know nothing of them but what is revealed; such is the Resurrection of the Dead: But then those Matters imply no Contradiction, and therefore ought not to be rejected. This first (the Resurrection) may be discovered to us by the Light of Revelation; and discovering no Contradiction in it, we ought to believe it. The second (the Trinity) clashing altogether with our natural Ideas, can be no Matter of Revelation, and therefore ought not to be believed. The Resurrection is such a Thing, as we could never have discovered by the Light of Nature; yet as soon as we come to know it, we assent to it, because we clearly perceive the Possibility thereof, and are sure it implies no Contradiction at all: but it is not so with the Trinity; such a Mystery can never be revealed to us, because Revelation cannot be contrary to Reason; and therefore the Trinity being contrary to this, cannot be the Matter of that. God indeed may reveal to us such Objects, as are unknown to Humane Reason; but let them be never so much above our Reason, they will never contradict it. *It is impossible to know, what is a Contradiction to the Nature of Things, whose Natures we do not understand.* Right! But we know so much of the Nature of God, that He is One, and not Three; and this is sufficient to shew that the Trinity is a Contradiction to the Nature of God.

What I say, is so clear and so notorious a Truth, that the Author himself is forced to acknowledg it; He saith, *p.* 147. 'We must 'not expound Scripture to such a Sense, 'as contradicts the plain and express Maxims 'of natural Reason: For though God reveals 'such Things to us, as natural Reason could 'not discover, and cannot comprehend; yet '*Revelation cannot contradict plain Reason*; for 'Truth cannot contradict it self; what is 'true in Revelation, can never be false in 'Reason; and what is true by natural Rea'son, can never be false in Revelation. All this he grants, only he saith, that we must be sure there is such a Contradiction; it must be evident and express, and not made out by uncertain Consequences, which many times are not owing to the Nature of Things, but to the Imperfection of our own Knowledge. This I grant too; But the Author won't allow the Trinity to be such a Contradiction; and endeavours to prove it: Let us hear him.

He soon perceives the difficulty, and therefore brings it in by way of an Objection. 'Yes, you'l say, that there should be Three 'Persons, each of which is God, and yet 'but One God, is a Contradiction. But 'what Principle of natural Reason does it 'contradict? Reason tells us, that Three 'Gods cannot be One God; but does Rea'son tell us, that Three Divine Persons can'not be One God? If my Reason be like 'other Mens, I am sure my Reason says no'thing at all about it, does neither affirm 'nor deny it.

Is not this an admirable Argument, which consists only in an Interrogation, and in a meer denial of the difficulty proposed in the Objection? *What Principle of natural Reason does it contradict? Does Reason tell us, that Three Divine Persons cannot be one God?* Here is the Interrogation or Query. To which I answer; Yes, it does contradict a plain Principle of natural Reason, even this, that Three cannot be One. *If my Reason be like other Mens, I am sure my Reason says nothing at all about it, doth neither affirm nor deny it.* Here

is

is a meer denial of the difficulty: I judge the Author's Reason must needs be very weak and corrupted, seeing it likes well this falshood, that Three are One; and finds no fault with it. Those unquestionably have a better sight, and a more sound Reason, who discern, it implies a Contradiction, that Three be but One; because they perceive and acknowledg that *Three is three times One*, and therefore cannot be only *once One*.

'Well (saith the Doctor, pleading for his 'Adversaries) if we believe Three distinct 'Divine Persons, each of which is God, we 'must believe Three distinct Gods. *I hope 'not*, when we profess to believe but One 'God: Yes, whatever we profess to believe, 'Three such distinct Persons must be Three 'Gods. Now *this we deny*, and *challenge them* 'to produce any plain Principle of Reason 'to prove that it must be so. Natural Rea'son teaches Nothing about the Personality 'of the Godhead: it teaches One God, but 'whether this One God be One or Three 'Persons, it says not, and therefore He may 'be either, without contradicting the na'tural Notions we have of One God; and 'then there is free scope for Revelation; and 'if Revelation teaches there is but One God, 'and that there are Three Divine Persons, 'each of which hath (in Scripture) not 'only the Title, but the Nature and At'tributes of God ascribed to him, then we 'must of necessity believe a Trinity in U'nity, Three Persons and one God. For 'what the Scripture affirms, and Reason 'does not deny, is a proper Object of our 'Faith; and then this Objection against this 'Faith, that Three distinct Divine Persons 'must be Three distinct Gods, if each of 'them be God, is senseless and ridiculous.

I have transcribed this whole Paragraph, because it deserves some particular Reflection. 1. I observe, that it contains no positive Proofs, but a meer denial. The Author is extreamly confident and bold; and yet all his reasonings may be resolved into *I hope not*, and *this we deny*. Indeed this is a very short way of answering Objections; and as easy as to *burn Books that are unanswerable*. There lies an Objection cross in his way, that if we believe Three distinct Divine Persons, we must believe Three distinct Gods. To this he answers, I hope not, when we profess to believe but one God. Is this a direct Confutation? must we be satisfied with such an Answer: because Trinitarians profess that Three Divine Persons are but one God; does it follow, that it is true, and cannot be doubted of? He *hopes not*, and he *denies it*, therein lies the strength of his Argument and Answer. 2. I should have added *his Challenge*; for this is his third way of confuting Objections. He challenges us to produce any plain Principle of Reason, to prove that Three distinct Divine Persons must be Three Gods. But we have a plain Principle of Reason at hand, to answer his Challenge, to wit, that it implies a Contradiction that Three be but One. 3. Here is a most absurd and ridiculous Paradox, as I ever heard of; *Natural Reason teaches nothing about the Personality of God or the Godhead; it teaches One God; but whether this One God be One or Three Persons, it says not.* What? If Reason tells us that *there is One God*; He must be One Intelligent Being. Now according to Reason we have no other Idea of Unity, but such as we have of a Man, a Beast, and a Tree. Therefore as Reason teaches that a Man is one Person, because he is one Intelligent Being; so it follows that according to Human Reason, God is but one Person, being but one Intelligent Being. Reason does not tell us that the Unity of God is different from the Unity of a Man: it produces in our Minds the same Idea of both; which being applied to God as well as to Man, must needs denote One Person or Intelligent Being in opposition to Two or Three. Nay, if Reason teaches nothing about the Personality of the Godhead (which the Author does not think fit to prove) *what Idea can we have of the Unity of God by Reason?* As long as we are ignorant, whether God be one or three Persons; our Idea of him must needs be more imperfect than of any other Being, in that very Notion which is so familiar to us, and which God himself has so much

urged, *viz.* his Unity. This is ſo falſe a Principle, and ſo contrary to the Dictates of Reaſon, that there never was any Man, *taught by Reaſon* that there is but one God, but did believe at the ſame time, that He is but one Perſon. The Author ſhould not have ventur'd abroad ſuch a Philoſophy, contrary to the Reaſon of all Mankind; but ought to have kept it for himſelf. Now I find that the Scripture doth perfectly agree with Reaſon. This tells me that there is but one God, who is but one Perſon; That teaches me the ſame, and alſo that the Father of our Lord Chriſt is that one God: both of them contrary to the Doctrine of the Trinity. 4. He ſaith; that there are Three Divine Perſons, each of which have (in Scripture) not only the Title, but the Nature and Attributes of God aſcribed to him. But where is the Holy Ghoſt called God in Scripture? He is indeed called the Spirit of God, but never God himſelf; and being the Power of God, 'tis no wonder that ſuch things are aſcribed to him, as are aſcribed to God himſelf. Thus it is ordinary to aſcribe to a Man's Courage, what he has done himſelf; and yet his Courage is no Perſon, nor diſtinct from him. This I ſay only by the way, to ſhew the ſtrangeneſs of his Conſequences. But I ſhall ſay nothing here of the Son: and indeed ſeeing he brings no particular Inſtances of what he advances, there is no need to inſiſt any longer on it.

CHAP. III.

I come now to examine his Anſwers, to the Objections againſt the Trinity in the brief Hiſtory of the Unitarians.

THE Firſt Objection, *p.* 154. *If our Lord Chriſt were himſelf God; there could be no Perſon greater than He, none that might be called his Head or God, none that could in any reſpect command him.* Let us hear, How the Doctor anſwers this Objection. 'Now (ſaith he) 'this Argument is fallacious; for tho Chriſt 'be God himſelf, yet if there be Three Per'ſons in the God-head, the Equality and 'Sameneſs of Nature does not deſtroy the 'Subordination of the Perſons: A Son is 'Equal to his Father by Nature, but Inferior 'to him as his Son. Now where is the Fallacy, but in the Author's Anſwer? His Compariſon of a Father with his Son, is ſhort of his purpoſe: for tho a Son be equal to his Father by Nature, yet he is not equal to him in Authority and Power; and therefore a Father is truly greater than his Son, *is his Head*, and *can command him.* This is not meerly a Subordination of Order, but of Power and Authority alſo. But it is not ſo with the Father and Son in the Trinity: they are not only equal by Nature, in the Author's Hypotheſis, but in Power and Authority; as they have the ſame Nature, ſo they have the ſame Attributes, whereby they are equal to one another in all Things. Now if it be ſo; how can the Father be ſaid to be *greater* than the Son, *who is as great as himſelf?* How can he be called his *Head*, which imports ſome Authority over Chriſt. As appears from 1 *Cor.* 11. 3. *But I would have you know, that the Head of every Man is Chriſt; and the Head of the Woman is the Man; and the Head of Chriſt is God.* It appears by this place, that God is the Head of Chriſt, as Chriſt is the Head of every Man, and the Man the Head of the Woman. Now Chriſt's being the Head of every Man, imports ſome Power and Authority over every Man, as the Man's being Head of the Woman imports a Power and Authority o-

ver

ver the Woman; and conſequently God's being the Head of Chriſt, muſt import an Authority and Power over Chriſt; elſe the Compariſon would be unreaſonable, fallacious and impertinent. But, I ſay, how can God be called the Head of Chriſt, in ſuch a Senſe? if Chriſt be as Great, and have as great Power and Authority as God has, how can God be called *his God?* To be ones God, is as much as to be his Benefactor and his Protector, according to the ſtile of Scripture; but Chriſt being All-mighty and ſelf-ſufficient, how can the Father be ſtiled his God, that is, his Benefactor and Protector? *I aſcend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God*, John 20. 17. *My God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me?* Mat. 27. 46. How could Chriſt ſay theſe things, on the Doctor's Hypotheſis; for being God as well as the Father, He muſt no leſs forſake himſelf, than the Father forſook him; and he might as well call himſelf *his own God*, and complain of himſelf that he had forſaken himſelf: Nay, being himſelf Almighty God as well as the Father, and being able to comfort himſelf in his Sufferings; how comes he to invoke the Father, or to call him *his God?* for thoſe Words plainly ſhew, that He expected and deſired from the Father the Aſſiſtance which He could not perform to Himſelf. Furthermore, how can we forbear conceiving Two Gods, according to this Hypotheſis? Chriſt, who invokes the Father, is God; the Father, whom He invokes, is God alſo; conſequently there are Two diſtinct Gods. Can he that invokes, and he that is invoked, be one and the ſame Being? I always thought that this ſuppoſed two ſeveral Beings. Laſtly, If our Lord Chriſt were himſelf God, how could any command him? He has all the Power and all the Authority, that the Father has; He is no more ſubject to the Father, than the Father to him; nay the Father and He are but One God.

The Author goes on; 'If the Father, as 'I have explained it, be original Mind and 'Wiſdom; the Son a Perſonal ſubſiſting, 'but reflex Image of the Father's Wiſdom; 'thô their Eternal Wiſdom be equal and 'the ſame, yet the Original is Superiour 'to the Image, the Father to the Son: And 'therefore thô I know ſuch Texts as he 'alledges, *My Father is greater than I*; *The 'Head of Chriſt is God*; *I aſcend to my Father 'and your Father, to my God and your God*; are 'both by Ancient and Modern Expoſitors 'applied to Chriſt's humane Nature; yet 'I ſee no Inconvenience, in owning this 'to be true, with reſpect to his Divine Perſon, and his Relation to the Father: For 'the Father is the Head and Fountain of 'the Deity; and therefore the Father may 'be called his God. Let us conſider this Paragraph.

The Son is a Perſonal Subſiſting, but Reflex Image of his Father's Wiſdom. What Gibberiſh is this! Has the Doctor found any where in Scripture, that the Son is *a Perſonal Subſiſting, but Reflex Image of his Father's Wiſdom?* Why does he not ſpeak the Language of Scripture? If his Words have any Senſe, he means, that the Father reflects upon his own Knowledge and Wiſdom: but how comes he to fancy, that a reflected Wiſdom, or to reflect on ones own Wiſdom, is a Divine Perſon and an Intelligent Being? One would think it only *an Act* of God, to reflect upon his own Knowledg, or other Perfections, without dreaming of a *Divine Perſon*; but Metaphyſicians, it ſeems, have a clearer Sight than other People: what is to others only an Act of God, the Metaphyſician diſcerns to be a Divine Perſon. 2. *The Original*, ſaith the Author, *is Superiour to the Image, the Father to the Son.* But the Superiority in the Trinity is only a Superiority of Order, which can admit of no ſuch Expreſſions as *Greater than Chriſt, the Head of Chriſt, the God of Chriſt*; as I ſhewed before. He ſees, he ſaith, no Inconvenience in owning this to be true with reſpect to Chriſt's *Divine Perſon*, and his Relation to his Father; becauſe the Father is the Head and Fountain of the Deity. I will ſhew more particularly, the ridiculouſneſs of this Aſſer-

tion, by inſiſting upon the firſt of the Paſſages before cited, as I have done upon the two others. Our Saviour ſeeing his Diſciples ſorrowful, becauſe He had told them, that He was going to his Father; and being willing to comfort them, and to leſſen their Sadneſs; tells them (*John* 14. 18.) *If ye loved me, ye would rejoyce, becauſe I ſaid, I go unto the Father; For my Father is greater than I.* One would think that Chriſt's meaning is, That the Diſciples ſhould be glad to hear that he leaves the World to go to his Father; becauſe his Father being greater than He, would undoubtedly crown his Obedience with an immortal Glory, and a Name which is above every Name. But this Author has found out another Senſe, which is worth the obſerving; *If ye loved me, ye would rejoyce, becauſe I ſaid I go to the Father; for the Father is greater than I*; *that is to ſay, the Father is the Head and Fountain of the Deity.* This would have been a very unſignificant Comfort; Be not ſorrowful for my leaving this World and going to the Father; *For the Father is the firſt Perſon of the Trinity.* Yet this ought to be the Interpretation of this Paſſage, if the Author's Aſſertion be true. Now I think the true meaning of this Phraſe, the Father is the Head and Fountain of the Deity, ſhould be this, *the Father is the firſt God*; as the Son is the ſecond God, and the Holy Ghoſt the third God. This Author may ſay ſo, if he pleaſes; I ſhan't contradict him, for that's the Conſequence that flows naturally from his Principles. But I ſhall deny, that the Father may be called *the God of Chriſt*: if Chriſt be the ſupream God as well as his Father, how can the ſupream God have a God over him? The term *God* relates only to Creatures; God cannot be ſaid to be the God of any but Creatures; this, common Senſe and the whole Current of Scripture teaches. Yes, you'l ſay, the Father is the Head and Fountain of the Deity. I anſwer, therefore you may in your Hypotheſis call him the firſt God; but by no means the God of the Son or Spirit, to whom He is not Superiour in Power, Authority, or other Divine Attribute.

The Author ſpeaks an unintelligible Jargon in his following Paragraph, which (I think) there is no need to inſiſt on: Therefore I ſhall here leave it to every rational Man to judge, whether we ought to reſt ſatisfied with ſuch a trifling Anſwer to the propounded Objection.

The ſecond Objection, *p.* 155. 'If our 'Lord Chriſt were indeed God, it could 'not without Blaſphemy be (abſolutely and 'without Reſtriction) affirmed of him, that 'He is the Creature, the Poſſeſſion, the 'Servant, and the Subject of God. To this 'the Author anſwers thus; That Chriſt is 'called a Creature, he proves, becauſe He 'is *the Firſt-born of every Creature*, Col. 1. 15, 'But here he ſhould have remembred his '*Abſolutely, and without Reſtriction*; for Chriſt 'is ſo the Firſt-born of every Creature, that 'He is *the Image of the Inviſible God*, and there-'fore no Creature. Surely, an abſurd Conſequence: I ſay on the contrary; Chriſt is the Image of the Inviſible God, and therefore a Creature. Let us ſee which of us is in the right. Every one may plainly ſee that, when St. *Paul* calls Chriſt the Image of the Inviſible God, he means, that He is a Viſible Image of an Inviſible God; and therefore he added the Epithet *Inviſible*; which otherways had been uſeleſs, not to ſay ridiculous. For then the Senſe of the Apoſtle's Expreſſion muſt be this; Chriſt is the Inviſible Image of the Inviſible God. Now the Nature of an Image is to be viſible to every ones Eye; or elſe it is no Image: But if Chriſt is called the Image of the Inviſible God, becauſe He is the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity; this ſecond Perſon being as Inviſible as the firſt, it follows that Chriſt is an Image of God as Inviſible as the Original; which is ridiculous. No, no; the *Man* Chriſt is the Image of the Inviſible God, by reaſon of his unſpotted Holineſs, and of the ſupream Power and Authority conferred on him. He is the Brightneſs of God's Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon; but ſuch an Image as *was Viſible* while He lived upon Earth, and may *now be ſeen* of all the.

In

Inhabitants of Heaven. Beſides, it does plainly appear by the Context, that St. *Paul* calls Jeſus Chriſt *Man*, the Image of the Inviſible God. *Who* (the Father) ſaith he at Ver. 13. *has delivered us from the Power of Darkneſs, and has tranſlated us into the Kingdom of his dear Son.* Ver. 14. *In whom we have Redemption thrô his Blood, even the forgiveneſs of Sins.* Ver. 15. *Who is the Image of the Inviſible God, the Firſt-born of every Creature.* There you ſee, that He who is the Image of the Inviſible God, is that dear Son in whom we have Redemption thrô his Blood; but He who *ſhed his Blood* for the Redemption of Men, muſt be Jeſus Chriſt *Man*; therefore Jeſus Chriſt *Man* is the Image of the Inviſible God. Now let any unprejudiced Man judge, which of theſe two Conſequences is right, either this of the Author, Chriſt is the Image of the Inviſible God, therefore no Creature; or mine, Chriſt is the Image of the Inviſible God, therefore a Creature.

He goes on. 'He is ſo born before all Creatures, as πρωτότοκ& alſo ſignifies, that 'by him were all things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, —and He is before 'all things (which is the Explication of πρωτότοκ& πάσης κτίσεως, Begotten before 'the whole Creation, and therefore no part 'of the Creation) *and by him all things conſiſt.* Τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε, all things were 'not only made by him, but have their Subſiſtence in him.

Now let us ſuppoſe, that πρωτότοκ& πάσης κτίσεως ought to ſignify *born before all Creatures*: I deny that, therefore Himſelf is no part of the Creation. The plain meaning of *born before all Creatures*, is, that Chriſt was born before any other Creature: As theſe Words, *Adam was born before all Men*, do not ſignify that he is no Creature, or no Man, but only that he was the firſt Man created. Therefore, I ſay, ſuppoſing that theſe Words πρωτότοκ& πάσης κτίσεως, are well tranſlated by *born before all Creatures*, I may with great reaſon draw a Conſequence contrary to the Author's, thus; Chriſt is born before all Creatures, therefore He is part of the Creation Himſelf.

The Author is very unhappy at drawing Conſequences. Here is another as falſe as the former; 'That this does not relate to 'the New Creation, as the *Socinians* would 'have it, is very plain. For, 1. In this 'Senſe Chriſt (if He were a meer Man) was 'not the Firſt-born of every New Creature. 'For I hope, there were a great many New 'Creatures, that is, truly Good and Pious 'Men, before Chriſt was born of his Virgin 'Mother. What? ſuppoſing *the New Creation by the Goſpel*, is here meant; can't Chriſt as a meer Man be the Firſt-born of every New-Creature; being the *Meſſias*, the Author and firſt Preacher of the Goſpel, the Head of the Church, the Fountain from which the Holineſs of every New Evangelical Creature does ſpring? In a Word, being the Author of this New Evangelical Creation, can't He alſo be the Firſt-born of every New Evangelical Creature? Thoſe *Socinians* that he ſpeaks of, by the New-Creation mean nothing elſe, but the New-Creation wrought by Chriſt and his Goſpel: and therefore, either this Author impoſes on them; or is not fully acquainted with their Opinions; or has no great Skill in Reaſoning.

I ſee, the Author does not underſtand the above-cited place. Therefore I think it worth while to explain it; the rather, becauſe 'tis one of the ſtrongeſt Holds of the *Trinitarians*; and to ſhow, that inſtead of favouring their Opinion, it overthrows it. In order thereunto; 1. I will prove, that the Old Creation, that is the Creation of the World, is not intended in that Text. 2. I will ſet down, what I take to be the true Senſe of that whole Context.

1. That the Creation of the World is not there meant. This I ſhall prove by Four Arguments. 1. He who is the Firſt-born of every Creature, is the ſame who ſhed his Blood (*ver.* 14.) for the Redemption of Men; as I noted before. Now he who *ſhed his Blood* for the Redemption of Men, can be no other but Jeſus Chriſt, *Man*: but this very Jeſus Chriſt *Man* is there ſtiled *the Firſt-born of every Creature, by whom all things were created, &c.*

as we translate the Words; Therefore this cannot be meant of the Creation of the World, which is the Work of God, not of a Man. Yes, you'l say; for He is God as well as Man; and therefore may be said to have created the World. I answer; Where have you found in Scripture, that *Christ is God as well as Man?* I know He is called *Man* in the Writings of the New Testament; but I could never find him there stiled *God-Man*, as He should have often been, if He was both. Does the Apostle make a distinction between his two Natures? does he say, we have Redemption thrô his Blood, *as He is a Man?* and that He is the First-born of every Creature, and has created all Things, *as He is God?* Not at all; but only tells us, That the same Jesus Christ, in whom we have redemption thrô his Blood, is the First-born of every Creature, and by whom all Things were created, *&c.* Why should we contrive a distinction of our own, when the Apostle makes none? But 2. I cannot but wonder, that Men should attribute the old or first Creation to Christ, since we have no Warrant from Scripture for it: I mean, that the Scripture does never say in express Words, that *Christ has created Heaven and Earth*, (which is the proper Description of the Old Creation, or of the Creation strictly and properly so called; and the Description usual in Scripture when it speaks of that Creation) as it is said that God *the Father of Christ* has. I do observe so great a difference between the Expressions of the Sacred Writers concerning the Creation of the World by God, and those Expressions which are supposed to import the same Creation by Christ; that I cannot forbear alledging some places concerning both. I omit those of the Old Testament, which are so many; and will insist only upon some taken out of the New. *God* (saith St. *Paul*, *Acts* 17. 24.) *that made the World and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of Heaven and Earth, dwelleth not in Temples made with Hands.* And Acts 4. 11. *Lord, thou art God, which hast made Heaven, and Earth, and the Sea, and all that is therein is.* Acts 14. 15. *We ---preach unto you, that ye should turn from these Vanities, unto the Living God, which made Heaven, and Earth, and the Sea, and all things that are therein.* And Rev. 14. 7. *Fear God, ---and worship him, that made Heaven and Earth, and the Sea, and the Fountains of Water.* This is the true and proper Description of the Creation of the World. Were it ascribed to Christ in such express Terms, we could not doubt that Christ had created the World: which if the Apostles had believed, they would undoubtedly have taught us so great a Truth, and that both in express and plain Terms, and often. No, Christ is never said to have created *Heaven and Earth, the Sea, and all that is therein.* In this very place the Apostle does not say, that the First-born created Heaven and Earth; but *All things that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth:* and the *All Things* of which he speaketh, he limiteth to all *Thrones, Dominions, Principalities and Powers*, visible and invisible; which shall be explained hereafter. This second Reflection, that *this Text contains not the proper Description of the Creation of the World used in Scripture*, being added to the foregoing, that *this Context speaks of Christ as Man*; ought to perswade any unprejudiced Man, that the Creation of the World is not here attributed to Christ. The Primitive Christians were so far from believing, that Christ created the World; that, as *the Father* only is called *God* in the Apostles Creed, so He only is stiled *Maker of Heaven and Earth*. 3. As the Epistle to the *Galatians* is an excellent Commentary on the Epistle to the *Romans*; so the Epistle to the *Ephesians* must be made use of, for the right understanding of the Epistle to the *Colossians*. The Design and Scope of those two Epistles is the same; so that we must look into the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, to find out the true Sense of this controverted Text in the *Colossians*. Now he that seriously compares these two Epistles with one another, will find that *Coloss.* 1. 15, 16, 17, 18. must be interpreted by *Ephes.* 1. 20, 21, 22. and *Ephes.* 1. 10. is a true Commentary on *Coloss.* 1. 20. *Coloss.* 1. 18. runs thus, *And He is the Head of the Body, the Church:*

who

who is the Beginning, the First-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the preeminence. To which answers part of the 22*d* verse in the *Ephesians*, in these Words; *And gave him to be Head over all things to the Church.* Col. 1. 15, 16, 17. runs thus; *Who is the Image of the invisible God, the First-born of every Creature: for by him were all things created* (as we translate the Word) *that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible and invisible; whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers: all things were created by him and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist.* To these Verses do answer the 20, 21, and part of the 22*d* verse of *Chap.* 1. to the *Ephesians*, in these Words; *He* (God) *raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right Hand in the Heavenly Places, far above all Principality and Power, and Might and Dominion, and every Name that is named, not only in this World, but in that which is to come: and hath put all things under his Feet.* Now in the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, we see, there is not the least intimation of the Creation ascribed to Christ; but only of his exaltation above all the Orders of Angels, and all earthly Powers: which plainly shows, that the Apostle meant not the Creation of the World in the forecited Verses of the Epistle to the *Colossians*. Nay, were it so, he would speak Non-sense. In the Epistle to the *Colossians*, he would tell us that Christ has created all the Orders of Angels, the visible and invisible Thrones, *&c.* which plainly shows that He is thereby as far above them, as the Creator is above his Creatures: but in the Epistle to the *Ephesians* he would tell us, that Christ *has been exaltud* far above all the Orders of Angels, and all Earthly Thrones and Powers; which undeniably proves, that He was not so before. Now what is a Contradiction, if this be not, to say that Christ created them, and that the Father set him far above them? We must therefore of necessity explain the Context of the *Colossians*, by that of the *Ephesians*; and put such a Sense upon it, as imports no true and proper Creation. 4. *Colos.* 1. 19, 20. being interpreted by *Ephes.* 1. 10. is a Confirmation of what I have said hitherto. The former (*Colos.* 1. 19, 20.) runs thus; *For it pleased the Father, that in him should all fulness dwell; and* (*having made Peace through the Blood of his Cross*) *by him to reconcile all things to himself, by him, I say, whether they be things in Earth, or things in Heaven.* To which answers the other Text (*Eph.* 2. 10.) in these Words; *That in the Dispensation of the fulness of time, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in Heaven, and which are in Earth, even in him.* No Man, I hope, will deny that ἀποκαταλλάξαι in the Epistle to the *Colossians*, which we render *to Reconcile*, ought to be interpreted by ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι in the Text of the *Ephesians*, which signifies *to gather together in one*, or to *sum up*. So that the meaning of both places is this, that it pleased God in the fulness of time, to unite both Angels and Men under one Head, even Christ, whom he set up Lord and King over them. Now this does perfectly agree with what St. *Paul* says to the *Ephesians*, concerning Christ's exaltation above all the Orders of Angels, and his being Head of the Church: for his Argument runs thus; God has exalted Christ above all the Orders of Angels, and made him Head of the Church, for he had decreed, in the fulness of time to unite both Angels and Men under one Head, Christ. But if the Text of the Epistle to the *Colossians*, is meant of the Creation of the World; this will be perfect Non-sense; for thus it ought to run: *Christ has created* all Orders of Angels, and all Powers on Earth, and was made Head of the Church; for *God had decreed*, in the fulness of time *to unite both Angels and Men under one Head, Christ.* No Man in the World can speak greater Non-sense than this would be, were the Creation of the World ascribed to Christ in the controverted Text. I desire the Author to reconcile his explication of these Words, *that in all things he might have the preeminence*, with what follows. That is (says he, at *p.* 157.) *that he might be the* πρωτότοκον, *the First upon all accounts, before the Worlds, and the First-born from the dead.* So the whole Argument (according to the Author) must

sum

run thus; Christ was the First upon all accounts, *before the Worlds*, and the First-born from the Dead; for God was pleased, *in the fulness of time* to unite both Angels and Men under Christ, as their Head. Could any thing be said more absurd and ridiculous? The Author's Skill in Scripture and Reason is, I think, alike.

2. Having thus proved that the Old Creation, or the Creation properly so called, is not ascribed to Christ in this Context of the *Colossians*; I come now to explain its true Sense, as clearly as possibly I can. Ver. 15. *Who is the Image of the Invisible God, the First-born of every Creature.* The meaning of these last Words is not, that Christ was begotten before all Creatures, as this Author would have it, but that *He is the Lord and King of every* (Intelligent) *Creature*; in Allusion to the First-born of a Family, who is Heir of all Things. This I prove by the 17 and 18th Verses; *Ver.* 17. αὐτός ἐστι πρὸ πάντων, *And He is before all things*, is the Explication of *the First-born of every Creature*; and signifies, not that He is before all Creatures in order of time, but of Dignity and Power, being by God set over all the Orders of Angels, and over the Church, as their Head and King. But if you don't rest satisfied with this parallel Place, the 18th Verse will afford an undeniable proof of what I say: There you find, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων, which is rightly rendred in our Bibles, *That in all things He might have the Preeminence*, both in Heaven and in Earth, among Angels and in the Church. I say now, these last Words ought to be the Explication of the two before-mentioned Expressions; to be *the First-born of every Creature*, and to be *before all Things*, ought to be interpreted by his *having the Præeminence in all Things*: so that *He is the First-born of every Creature*, is this, *He hath the Preeminence over every Creature.* Thus by the Context it self, we find out the true sense of πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, which in the English we translate *First-born of every Creature*: And thus too are these Words interpreted by the principal Critics among the Orthodox, (as they are called) *Gomarus, Camero, Piscator, Drusius, Vorstius, Davenant, Daly, Grotius*, (for they will have him also to be Orthodox) *Hammond.*

I come now to the next Verse, *For by him were all Things created.* I have fully proved, they cannot be understood of the Old Creation, the Creation of Heaven and Earth, and the Sea, and of the Things in them, which is the Creation properly so called; therefore to reconcile this Verse with the foregoing, and with the Words before cited out of the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, (*He* [God] *sit Him at his own Right-Hand, far above all Principality and Power, — and every Name that is named*;) The word ἐκτίσθη, which we render *Created*, ought to be rendred *Modelled*, *Disposed*, or *Reformed* into a new Order. So that the Sense will run thus; 'Christ is *the Lord* of every Creature, 'for by him are all both Visible and Invisible Creatures, even all Men and Angels, 'Modelled or Disposed into a new Order, 'being subjected to Him and His Commands: As for Angels, all the Orders of 'them, whether they be Thrones or Dominions, none of them are exempted from 'his Power and Authority; he rules over 'them, (which is the meaning of Ver. 17.) 'and they are all as it were compacted in 'one Body under his Conduct; as for Men, 'as He is the Beginning and the First-born 'from the Dead, so He was also made Head 'of the Church his Body; so that in all 'things He has the Preeminence, He rules 'in Heaven and on Earth, over Angels and 'over the Church, which is the Sense of Ver. 18. This I hope makes a clear Sense, agreeable to the whole Context, and to the Text in the *Ephesians*. I observe that as αὐτός ἐστι πρὸ πάντων, or *He is before all Things*, is the Explication of πρωτότοκος, &c. Or *He is the First-born of every Creature*: So καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε, or *and by him all Things consist*, or are compacted into one Body, ought to be the Explication of ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα, or *by him were*

all

all Things (not *created*, as 'tis rendred in the English, but) Modelled or Reformed. I know not, why Dr. *Sherlock* has called this a Socinian Explication; as if it were devised by them, to serve their Hypothesis; the truth is, the chief of the Orthodox Interpreters, have thus explained this Context of the *Colossians*. Among the Ancients, St. *Cyril*, *Fulgentius*, *Procopius*, *Gaeus*, and even *Athanasius* himself: Of the Moderns, *Salmero*, *Montanus*, *Grotius*, and many more. Before I put an end to this, I must observe; that our Author is greatly mistaken in his Explication of *Col.* 1. 18. The Apostle (says he) proceeds from Christ's Creation of the natural World, to his Mediatory Kingdom: Which proves, that He did not speak of that before. I see the Author does not observe his own rule (*p.* 146.) *To consider, in expounding Scripture, what goes before, and what follows.* It was no hard matter to see, that the Apostle at Ver. 16. speaks, First in the general of Things that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, Visible and Invisible: but then afterwards he explains, what he meant by the Things that are in Heaven, *viz.* all the Orders of Angels; this he doth in the latter part of the same Verse; and what he means by Things that are on Earth, He tells us fully at Ver. 18. *viz.* the Church. The 18*th* Verse, being an Explication of some part of Ver. 16. it appears not to have been *Paul*'s Design, to proceed from Christ's Creation of the World to his Mediatory Kingdom.

Thus I have done with the famous Context of *Col.* 1. 15, 16, *&c.* The Author of *the Brief History* had proved, that Christ was God's Minister and Servant, because He was *appointed or made by God, the Apostle and High-Priest of our Profession.* To this the Author, I am now considering, Answers; 'But here 'is *a Restriction* to his being High-Priest, 'and therefore no danger of Blasphemy, 'tho He be God. For we may observe, 'that thô the Jewish High-Priest was but 'a Man, yet he was a type of an High-Priest 'who is more than Man, even the eternal 'Son, or *Word* of God; as some of the 'Learned Jews acknowledge. This is indeed an admirable Answer; Christ has been appointed by God an High-Priest, which seems to prove, that Himself is not God. No, says the Doctor, you are mistaken; for thô the Jewish High-Priest was but a Man, yet He was a Type of an High-Priest more than Man, of an High-Priest who is the eternal Son of God. How does he prove it? *As some*, says he, *of the Learned Jews acknowledge.* And what then; if some Learned Jews have spoken non-sense, must we speak non-sense too? One would expect, the Author should prove by Scripture, and not by Jewish Writers, that the Jewish High-Priest was a type of an High Priest, who is the eternal Son and Word of God. The Jewish High-Priest being a Type of Christ, was a Type of an High-Priest more eminent and greater than Himself in all respects, thô he were not God.

He goes on. 'For the Son of God is 'the only proper Mediator and Advocate 'with the Father. If you ask him, why? he will answer; '*Philo Judæus*, who often 'calls the λόγος or *Word* the ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς or '*High-Priest*, says so; and shows that the 'Garments of the High-Priest were Figures 'of Heaven and Earth. Which seems to 'signify that the eternal Word which made 'the World, is the true High-Priest. Here comes upon the stage, one of his Learned Jews, *Philo*; by whose Testimony he proves, that the second Person of the Trinity is the only proper Mediator and Advocate with the Father. But *Philo* being *Plato*'s Follower, did not believe such a Trinity as the Doctor teaches. Sure there is a great difference between *Plato*'s three Principles, and the Doctor's Trinity. But if there were not; must we believe *Philo Judæus*, rather than St. *Paul*, who plainly tells us (in direct opposition to *Philo*) that as *there is One God*, so there is *One Mediator between God and Men, the MAN Christ Jesus*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. As for the Garments of the High-Priest, which *Philo* will have to be a Figure of

Heaven and Earth; and our Author's Story about *Jaddus*; both which our Author alledges as Arguments, at leaſt as Congruities, whereby to prove the Divinity of Chriſt; I ſhall ſo far truſt the Judgment of the meaneſt Reader, as to take no notice of them. That which follows, is no leſs ridiculous; 'I am 'ſure (ſays the Author) the Apoſtle diſtin-'guiſhes Chriſt from *High-Prieſts taken from* '*among Men*, and makes his Sonſhip the 'Foundation of his Prieſthood, *Heb.* 5. 1, 6. The contrary to both theſe is true, and evident alſo in the Text he cites. The Prieſthood is the Foundation of the Sonſhip; and *Aaron* and Chriſt are there made Inſtances of High-Prieſts taken from among Men. The Objection therefore remains ſtill; that Chriſt being an High-Prieſt appointed and *made by God*, cannot Himſelf be God.

He goes on: 'As for his next Objection '(from 1 *Cor.* 3. 23.) *Chriſt is God's.* I 'know not what he means by it; for there 'is no doubt but Chriſt is God's Son, God's 'Chriſt, God's High-Prieſt, ſerves the Ends 'and Deſigns of God's Glory; and what 'then? Therefore he is not God: by no 'means! he may conclude that He is not 'God the Father; becauſe He acts ſubor-'dinately; not that therefore He is not 'God the Son. The Author of the *Brief Hiſtory* meant (I ſuppoſe) this; that as [*you are Chriſt's*] in that Text, ſignifies Men are ſubject to Chriſt; ſo [*Chriſt is God's*] muſt ſignify, Chriſt is ſubjected to God, and therefore not Himſelf God. This I think is good Senſe, and a good Argument. But can it be ſaid, that the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity, who is the ſupream God; nay, One God with the Firſt, is God's Son, God's Chriſt, God's High Prieſt, ſerves the Ends and Deſigns of God's Glory? All theſe Titles denote a dependance upon the Father, and a real ſubjection to Him; which cannot agree to any Perſon who is indeed Himſelf a Supream God.

Here is another ſenſleſs Anſwer, to a good and ſtrong Objection. 'P. 158. His next 'proof is; That God calls Chriſt his Ser-'vant in the Prophet *Iſaiah*. But it is his 'Servant *in whom his Soul was pleaſed*; which 'is the peculiar Character of his Son; and 'is that very Teſtimony which God gave to 'Chriſt at his Baptiſm, *This is my beloved* '*Son in whom I am well pleaſed.* I deſire here the Reader to obſerve the Doctor's accurate way of reaſoning. This is the Objection: Chriſt is called God's Servant, therefore He is not God. No, this is a miſtake, ſays He; for Chriſt is God's *beloved* Servant.

P. 159. He ſays in anſwer to the Objection from *Phil.* 2. 8, 9. 'Becauſe He volun-'tarily condeſcends below the Dignity of 'his Nature; does He forfeit the Dignity of 'his Nature? But I ask; can it be ſaid of the Supream God, *with whom is no Variableneſs, neither Shadow of turning*, that He has condeſcended below the Dignity of his Nature?

P. 159, 160. He goes on in a florid way of Speech to ſhow, how inconſiſtent it is that Chriſt, were He a meer Creature, ſhould be advanced to that Power and Authority, whereunto He has been promoted.

Hereupon I obſerve; 1. The Dignity conferred upon Chriſt ought not to be called, *the Supream* Government of the World; as this Author has ſtiled it: For He acts and governs in Subordination to his Father. 2. When the Scripture ſpeaks of this Advancement of Chriſt, it extends it eſpecially over Angels and Men. 3. It is *no Indignity* to Angels, as our Author pretends, to be ruled and governed by a Man, whom God has exalted above them. Angels indeed have ſome natural Prerogatives above Men, whereby they are more excellent Creatures than Men: but if it pleaſes God of his free Gift, to inveſt a Man with greater Dignity, Power, and all other Excellence, than any Angel has; why can't He be ſet over them, as their Lord and Ruler, in Subordination to God? There is no Incongruity in it. 4. That, contrary to the Author's Aſſertion, a meer Creature may be a fit Lieutenant or Repreſentative of God in Perſonal and Prerogative Acts of Government or Power.

Thus

Thus *Saul* and *David* were ſet over the *Iſraelites*, to govern and rule over them by God's Appointment, in Subordination to him. Nay we do commonly ſay, That the King is the Lieutenant and Repreſentative of God. 5. God communicated to Chriſt ſuch Wiſdom and Power, as is neceſſary to enable him to exerciſe the Dignity conferred on him. In all this, there is not the leaſt *Inconſiſtency*.

But notwithſtanding his foregoing Objections, he confeſſes, the Difficulty remains. *P.* 161. 'If He be by Nature the Son of 'God, and Natural Lord of the World; how 'is He ſaid to be exalted by God, and to 'receive a Kingdom from him, as the re-'ward of his Righteouſneſs and Sufferings? 'He was before poſſeſſed of it, ever ſince 'the Foundation of the World; being na-'tural Lord of all his Creatures: He had 'no need to receive that which was his 'own, or purchaſe what was his natural 'Right, by ſuch mean and vile Condeſcen-'ſion as ſuffering Death on the Croſs. Now to reconcile this, he makes a long Diſcourſe concerning *the Mediatory Kingdom* of Chriſt; which (ſaith he) hath been beſtowed on the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity, and is peculiar to Him, and diſtinguiſhed from the Natural Government of the World, which He has in Conjunction with the Father. This Chimerical Syſtem I may overthrow, I think, by that ſingle Text of St. *Paul* already cited; *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the MAN Chriſt Jeſus.* If Chriſt is a Mediator, and has the Mediatory Kingdom, as He is the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity, that is, as He is God; why does the Apoſtle tell us, that He is a Mediator bearly as He is Man? At leaſt he ſhould have told us, that the Mediator is the *God-Man* Jeſus Chriſt. It is unaccountable that the Apoſtle, who in all his Epiſtles ſets forth the Excellency and Glory of Chriſt, in the moſt expreſſive Terms; ſhould tell us that the MAN Chriſt Jeſus is the Mediator between God and Men, if the Mediatory Kingdom is exerciſed by the Divine Perſon or Nature, and if (not Chriſt *Man*, but) Chriſt God is the Mediator. But let us examine the Grounds our Author goes on.

He tells us, *ibid.* 'A Mediatory King-'dom was neceſſary, to reconcile God and 'Men; to reſtore Man to the Integrity of 'his Nature: and this Power and Dignity 'God beſtowed on his own Son; who had 'the moſt Right to it, and was the beſt 'qualified for it, being *the begotten Word* 'and *Wiſdom* of the Father. Now one would expect, he ſhould cite ſome Texts of Scripture, to prove this Aſſertion; but he could find no place to rely on. But Chriſt muſt, ſays he, firſt become Man, and perform the whole Will of God, and then He ſhall be exalted. Whereupon he makes this Obſervation; (*pag.* 162.) 'All the 'Power Chriſt is inveſted with, is as Head 'of the Church: *God has put all Things under his Feet; and given him to be Head over all Things to the Church; which is his Body, the Fulneſs of him that filleth all Things*; 'Eph. 1. 22, 23. That is, ſaith he, God 'has made him Governour of the World, 'as Head of the Church. I obſerve two Things upon this place. 1. That this Text is not well interpreted. The firſt part of it relates to the foregoing Verſe, and ought to be explained by it: God, ſaith the Apoſtle, at Ver. 21. *Set Chriſt at his own Right-Hand in the Heavenly Places, far above all Principality and Power, and every Name that is named, not only in this World, but in that which is to come.* Ver. 23. *And hath put all Things under his Feet.* What Things? Thoſe that are before mentioned, all the Orders of Angels and all Earthly Powers. And then follows; *And gave him to be Head*, &c. This is the ſenſe; not, that Chriſt was made Governour of the whole World, as Head of the Church. 2. But, what if all the Power Chriſt is inveſted with, is as Head of the Church? Will it not follow, that all the Power He is inveſted with, is as a Man, not as God? And this alſo I prove by *Col.* 1. 18. *And He is the Head of the Body the Church, who is the Beginning, the Firſt-born from the Dead.*

He who is the First-born from the Dead, can be no other but the MAN Jesus Christ; but He who is the First-born from the Dead, is the Head of the Church, as that Text expressly saith: therefore the MAN Christ Jesus is the Head of the Church. Thus the Apostle very plainly telling us; that the Mediator and Head of the Church is the Man Christ Jesus, destroys our Author's Notion of Christ's Mediatory Kingdom, or that it is grounded on and exercised by his Divine Nature or Person. Further, if Christ *God* is the Mediator, if the Mediatory Kingdom belongs to and is managed by the second Person of the (supposed) Trinity, I don't see, how the Government of *Israel* can be a Type of this Kingdom, as this Author says at p. 162, 163. For the King of the *Israelites* was between God and his People, and was really *diverse from both*; but Christ in our Author's Hypothesis, is God himself, *One with the Father* and the Holy Ghost; so that he must be a Mediator between himself and Men, which besides that it is contrary to the Notion of a Mediator, does wholly destroy the Parallel.

He says at *pag.* 164, 165. that, 'We certainly know from the Expositions of Christ 'and his Apostles, that the Prophets spake 'of Christ under the Names of *Lord*, *God*, 'and *Jehovah*. But I desire him, to reconcile these Texts with his Opinion; *Heb.* 1. 1, 2. *God, who at sundry Times and in divers Manners, spake in times past to the Fathers by the Prophets; hath in these Last Days spoken unto us by his Son.* Heb. 2. 2, 3. *For if the Word spoken by Angels was stedfast; — How shall we escape, if we neglect so great Salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord?* Gal. 3. 19. The Law *was ordained by Angels, in the Hand of a Mediator*, i. e. by the Intervention of *Moses*. Acts 7. 53. *Who have received the Law by the Disposition of Angels.* Ver. 38. *This* [Moses] *is He who was with the Church in the Wilderness, with the Angel who spake to him in Mount* Sinai. These Texts do more than sufficiently prove, that the Son of God is not meant by the Prophets and other Writers of the Old Testament, where they mention *the Lord*, *God*, and *Jehovah*. But to return to Christ's Mediatory Kingdom.

He says *pag.* 167. 'The Son has *a Kingdom* 'of his own, which is *peculiarly his*; and administred in his Name, and by his Sovereign 'Authority. But, how is this consistent with what we read *pag.* 168. 'The Power indeed 'whereby he administers his Kingdom, is the 'Power of the whole Trinity, of Father, 'Son, and Holy Ghost: for they being es'sentially one God, have but one Energy and 'Power, and therefore can never act sepa'rately. How can the Son, or the second Person of that Trinity, have *a Kingdom of his own*: if whatever he does, is also done by the Father and Holy Ghost; have not they hereby as great a share in this Kingdom, as the Son? This therefore is a plain Contradiction, and perfect Non-sense. Let us hear him further, *pag.* 169, 170. 'The Power is 'not taken out of God's Hands, that is im'possible: Father, Son and Holy Ghost go'vern the World still, by one individual Act 'and Power; but as in the Natural Govern'ment of the World, the exercise of this 'Power begins with the Father; so in the 'exercise of this Mediatory Kingdom, it be'gins with the Son, and is directed by his 'Mediation. That is, God governs the World 'now, not meerly as a Natural Lord, by the 'Rules of Natural Justice; but with respect 'to the Mediatory Power and Authority of 'his Son, and to serve the ends of his Medi'atory Kingdom. This Chimerical reasoning will not free the Author's System from Contradiction. For as in the Natural Government of the World, tho (as he dreams) the exercise of the Power begins with the Father, yet the Son and Holy Spirit acting in conjunction with the Father, *by an individual Act*; it cannot be said that the Power or Kingdom is peculiar to the Father: so in the supposed Mediatory Kingdom, tho the exercise of the Power begins with the Son; yet as long as the Father and Holy Spirit act together with him, and can never act separate-

ly;

ly; it cannot be ſaid, that *the Son has a Kingdom of his own*, or that he is the Mediatory King, more than the Father or Spirit. Yet by the help of this contrived Mediatory Kingdom, our Author undertakes (at *pag.* 173.) to overthrow the Fourth Argument in the Hiſtory of the *Unitarians*; even this, becauſe God doth all things in his own Name, and by his own Authority, but Chriſt comes in the Father's Name, does his Will, and ſeeks his Glory. 'This only proves (ſays he) that 'he is not the Father but the Son, and the 'King of God. For this Mediatory Kingdom '(as he ſays at *pag.* 172.) is erected by the 'Father; and by him given to the Son. But I ask, is not the Son equal to the Father, both in Energy and Authority? How then can he be ſaid to be ſent by his Father, to receive his Commands, and to ſeek his Glory? Can all this be aſcribed to the Supream God? Nay, if the Father together with the Son and Spirit, be but one God; is it not abſurd to ſay that the Father ſends the Son, and the Son does the Will of the Father? Why not rather, in his own Mediatory Kingdom, does his own Will, ſeeks his own Glory? I think, I could as ſoon believe White is Black, as ſwallow the Abſurdities of our Author's Mediatory Kingdom. But 'tis plain to every diſcerning Reader, that he has often not underſtood what he ſaid.

Having thus ſhown the Abſurdity of his Hypotheſis, concerning Chriſt's Mediatory Kingdom: I will ſet down in a few Words, what I take to be the true Notion of Chriſt's Kingdom. God had promiſed to *David*, that he would eſtabliſh his Throne for ever; and there ſhould never be wanting one of his Seed to ſit thereon; Pſal. 89. 3, 4. *I have made a Covenant with my Chooſen, I have ſworn unto* David *my Servant; thy Seed will I eſtabliſh for ever, and build up thy Throne to all Generations.* And again, verſ. 29. *His Seed will I make to indure for ever, and his Throne as the Days of Heaven.* Again ver. 35, 36, 37. *Once I have ſworn by my Holineſs, that I will not lie unto* David: *his Seed ſhall indure for ever, and his Throne as the Sun before me; it ſhall be eſtabliſht for ever as the Moon, and as a faithful Witneſs in the Heavens.* Now that this Promiſe does not relate, only or chiefly, to *David*'s Succeſſors in the Political Government of *Iſrael*, without any reſpect to the *Meſſias*, who was alſo the Son of *David*; does plainly appear by the Event: for the Political Kingdom of *David* has been deſtroyed for ſeveral Ages, and the Series of Succeſſors in the *Davidical* Line is utterly broken off. This Promiſe therefore had its full Accompliſhment in our *Meſſias* Jeſus Chriſt, who is the Son of *David*, and the King of *Iſrael*. But this Kingdom of Chriſt is both more ample and more durable than *David*'s was. *For all Power is given to him, both in Heaven and Earth*, Mat. 28. 18. And (1 Cor. 15. 25, 26.) *He muſt reign, till he has put all Enemies under his Feet; the laſt Enemy that ſhall be deſtroyed, is Death.* Thus his Throne ſhall indure as long as the Sun and Moon. He may be called, with greater reaſon than *David* was (Pſal. 89. 27.) *God's Firſt-born, Higher than the Kings of the Earth*: for he is (*Rev.* 19. 16.) *King of Kings, and Lord of Lords*; (Rev. 1. 5.) *Prince of the Kings of the Earth.* But his Power reaches not only over Men, but over Angels too; (1 Per. 3. 22.) *He is on the right hand of God, Angels, and Authorities, and Powers being made ſubject to him.* This is God's Anointed, whom he has inveſted with the Power of enacting Laws for the good of his Subjects. When God did not ſo immediately govern *Iſrael*, as during the Theocracy, but by Kings; *David*, as God's Deputy and Vicegerent, appointed Muſick, Singers, Porters; and made ſuch other Regulations, as were fit in the Worſhip of God: So Chriſt, who is a King immediately appointed by God, by virtue of the Power *and Inſtructions* given to him, took away the Ceremonial Law, ſet up a Spiritual Worſhip; and being a King over the Gentiles as well as over the Jews, made ſuch Laws as were able to unite them into one Body, in the Worſhip of one God; that there might be but one Flock, and one Shepherd. Chriſt's Kingdom is not only Spiritual, but Temporal; I mean, he has ſo much Power over all Creatures, as

is

is neceſſary to enable him, to perform the ends of his Spiritual Kingdom. Nor is this contradicted by our Saviour's Words, at *John* 18.35. The Original has it not, *My Kingdom is not of this World*, but *from* this World. ἐκ τῆς κόσμε τέτε, i. e. My Kingdom is not owing to Men, but to God's own appointment: I am a King indeed, but this Kingdom I received from God's own Hands: My Kingdom is *not from hence*, as he explains it, but from above. Acts 2. 36. *God has made that ſame Jeſus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Chriſt*, i. e. *King*. And chap. 17. 31. *He has appointed a Day, in which he will judge the World in Righteouſneſs, by the MAN whom he has ordained.* 1 Cor. 15. 24, 28, *Then cometh the end, when he ſhall deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father.* ----*Then ſhall the Son be alſo ſubject to him, that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.*

This, I take to be the true account of Chriſt's Kingdom, according to Scripture. Thus God performed the Oath, which he ſware to *David*; even by *raiſing up an Horn of Salvation in his Houſe*, Luke 1. 69. Thus the Kingdom of Chriſt, who is the Seed of *David*, ſhall laſt as long as the Sun and Moon. But we no where find in Scripture, that this Kingdom is beſtowed upon him, as he is the Eternal Son of God, and Second Perſon of the Trinity. St. *Paul* was ſo far from believing that; that diſcourſing of the principal Act of Chriſt's Kingly Power and Authority, *viz.* his judging the World; he ſays, that *God* has appointed a Day to perform this, by the MAN whom he has ordained, *Acts* 17. 31. In a Word, as Chriſt has been exalted by God, and has received a Kingdom from him: So when the appointed End cometh, he ſhall deliver it up to God, and remain SUBJECT to him, as St. *Paul* expreſly teaches, 1 *Cor.* 15. 28. Theſe two things demonſtratively prove, that Chriſt is a King, barely as a Man; and that his Mediatory Kingdom, ſo much ſpoken of by our Author, is a Chimera.

I proceed now to his other Anſwers, to this Objection, That Chriſt knows not the day of Judgment. He replies (*pag.* 177.) 'Chriſt in that Text ſpeaks of himſelf as 'Man: St. *Matthew* does not mention *the Son*, 'which ſhews that the Son is included in 'St. *Matthew*'s οὐδείς, *None*, or no Man; and 'therefore theſe Texts muſt ſpeak of Chriſt 'only as a Man. I anſwer, ſo they do, for he is no more than a Man. St. *Mark* tells us, that Chriſt as *the Son* (of God) knows not that Day and Hour. Now our Author will have Chriſt's *Sonſhip* founded in his Eternal Generation from the Father; and that he is *the Son* not as he is Man, but as he is God, ſo he ſaith at *pag.* 166. and elſewhere. This is indeed a very eaſy diſtinction, were it but true: but *Trinitarians* are the Authors of it, not Scripture. In St. *Mark*'s Gradation Chriſt is named after Men and Angels, to ſhew his preſent Excellence and Exaltation above them: but in St. *Matthew*, that very Son of God, who is above Men and Angels, is included in the *None*, or no Man. Thus this glorious Title of *the Son* of God, denotes here Chriſt *Man*. As *the Father* in St. *Mark* is God; ſo *the Son* of God, who knows not that Day and Hour, is Chriſt *Man*, who is ſo ſtiled in all the New Teſtament without any reſpect to a ſecond Nature.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

THE ſixth Argument in the *Brief Hiſtory* runs thus: 'God giveth what, and 'to whom He pleaſes; He needs not the 'aid of any other; He intreateth not for 'Himſelf or his People; He cannot die; 'and deriveth his Power from none but 'Himſelf: But 'tis certain, that the Lord 'Chriſt could not himſelf, without the pre-'vious Ordination of the Father, confer the 'prime Dignities of Heaven, or of the 'Church. He placed his Safety in his Fa-'ther's Preſence and Help; he prayed often 'and fervently to the Father, both for him-'ſelf and for his Diſciples; he died, and 'was raiſed from the Dead by the Father; 'after his Reſurrection he received from 'another, all that great Power which he 'now injoys. To this he anſwers; 'Chriſt 'interceeds with no Creature, receives Au-'thority from no Creature, *&c.* nor from 'any God neither, who is ſeparated from 'himſelf: For he is One God with the Fa-'ther and the Holy Ghoſt. That he inter-'ceeds with the Father, proves indeed that 'he is a diſtinct Perſon from the Father; 'not, that he is not one God with him. But why, I pray, does it not prove that, he is not one God with the Father? For if he intercedes with God, can he be that very God with whom he intercedes? if he is, what need is there for him to intercede? Beſides; this Author ſays before (*pag.* 167, 169, 170.) *The Three Divine Perſons can never act ſeparately, they have but One Energy*, and whatever is done they do it *by one Individual Act.* Now I hope he will grant, that Prayer and Interceſſion are real Acts or Actions: I infer, therefore when the Son intercedes, the Father and Holy Spirit muſt intercede too. Thus Interceſſion and Prayer are not peculiar to the Son; but there are in the Godhead three Interceſſors, three Beſeeching Perſons: Whom, what Perſon or God, does this Trinity beſeech? Good God! how long ſhall it be, that Men will love Darkneſs rather than Light; and prefer a Novel and Unintelligible Goſpel, before the old, plain and eaſy One?

Pag. 183. He ſays; 'For God to make 'a Creature, Advocate and Mediator, is to 'give a Creature Authority over himſelf; 'which cannot be: for it is a Debaſement 'to the Divine Nature, and a reproach to 'the Divine Wiſdom; it is as if God did 'not better know, how to diſpoſe of his 'Grace and Mercy, than any Creature does. But why ſo? has our Author forgot, or is he to learn, that *Moſes*, thô a meer Creature, was a Mediator between God and his People? I am ſure, St. *Paul* calls him ſo in theſe Words, at *Gal.* 3. 19. *The Law was ordained by Angels, in the Hand of a Mediator.* And at *Deut.* 5. 5. *He ſtood between the Lord and them, to ſhew them the Word of the Lord.* And the ſame Apoſtle tells us, that the MAN Jeſus Chriſt is a Mediator between God and Men. Does not the Scripture mention *Moſes* his Interceſſion with God; and that God was moved by his Intreaty? Why then does this Author affirm, that *to intercede with the Authority of a Mediator, is above the Nature and Order of Creatures?*

To the next Argument; *viz.* That Jeſus Chriſt is in Holy Scripture always ſpoken of, as a diſtinct and different Perſon from God; and deſcribed to be the Son of God, and the Image of God. He anſwers, 'This we own, 'and he had no need to prove it: This is 'a wonderful Argument to convince thoſe, 'who acknowledg Three diſtinct Perſons in 'the Godhead; that Chriſt is not God be-'cauſe he is a diſtinct Perſon from the Fa-'ther;

'ther; for ſo according to the Language of 'Scripture, *God* ſignifies *God the Father*, when 'he is diſtinguiſhed from the Son and Holy 'Spirit; as all Men grant. Let the Author abate a little of his Confidence. Is an Ironical Anſwer ſufficient, to confute a good and a ſtrong Argument? This is *a wonderful Argument*, ſays he, to prove that Chriſt is not God. When St. *Paul* ſays in his Salutations, *Grace be to you, and Peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; who would gueſs, that Jeſus Chriſt is God as well as the Father? he, nor any other ſacred Writer ever ſays, that there are Three Perſons in the Godhead, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; he calls only the Father, *God*, and diſtinguiſhes the Lord Chriſt from him. If the Lord Chriſt is God as well as the Father, the Apoſtle ſhould have framed his Salutation thus; *Grace be to you, and Peace from God the Father; and from the God Man Jeſus Chriſt.* But according to the Language of Scripture, ſays he, *God* ſignifies *God the Father*, when he is diſtinguiſhed from the Son and Holy Spirit. I anſwer; that is a Demonſtration, that the Father only is God; elſe the Title *God* could not be appropriated to him, when he is diſtinguiſhed from the Son and Spirit. And to diſcern ſo much, a Man can lack nothing but common Senſe. But I obſerve farther to this Anſwer; that ſuppoſing Chriſt were but a Man, the Apoſtle could have expreſſed himſelf no otherways; from whence it follows, that either the Apoſtle did indeed ſo think, and ſo teach; or this Author muſt charge him, as not knowing how to ſpeak correctly and properly.

'Tis impoſſible, ſaith the *Brief Hiſtory*, 'that the Son or Image of the One true 'God, ſhould himſelf be that One true 'God; as impoſſible as that the Son ſhould 'be the Father, or the Image that very 'Thing whoſe Image it is. 'This is meer 'Sophiſtry, ſaith our Author; for if the 'Father and the Son and the Holy Ghoſt 'be the One true God; they are the ſame 'One true God, and yet the Father is not 'the Son, nor the Son the Father. I appeal to the Reader, whether this be not a meer denial of the Difficulty, not an Explication or a Solution of it? The Son, ſaith the Hiſtorian, can't be the One true God, becauſe he is the Son and Image of the One true God; for the Son cannot be the Father, nor the Image the very Thing whoſe Image it is. Yes, ſays our Anſwerer, God and the Image of God *are the ſame One true God.*

The next Argument of the *Hiſtory* is, that 'Many Texts expreſly declare, That 'only the Father is God. In anſwer to this, ſays our Author: 'This would be a 'Demonſtration, could he produce any one 'Text which aſſerts, that only the Father, 'in oppoſition to the Son and Holy Ghoſt, 'is God: for then the Father muſt ſigni'fy the Perſon of the Father, in oppoſition 'to the Perſon of the Son, and the Perſon 'of the Holy Ghoſt. But has not the Hiſtorian produced ſuch a Text? *John* 17. 3. *Father, — this is Life Eternal, to know Thee [the ONLY true God] and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent:* Or, Jeſus Chriſt thy Meſſenger. Here, *the Father*, to whom the Son directs his Prayer (as appears by Ver. 1.) is called *the only true God*; and the Son, Jeſus Chriſt *whom he hath ſent*, or his Meſſenger. Here the Father as the Sender, *is oppoſed* to the Son as the Meſſenger; and the Firſt called the ONLY true God, the Other an Apoſtle or Meſſenger. Our Author adds; 'But when the Father is called the only true 'God, only in oppoſition to all the falſe 'Gods, which the World then worſhipped; 'there *Father* does not ſignify *Perſonally*, 'but that one Godhead or Divinity, of which 'the Father is the Source, the Fountain 'and the Original. So ſoon has this Author forgot his own Obſervation and Rule of Interpretation, that, *according to Scripture, God ſignifies God the Father, whenever he is diſtinguiſhed from the Son or Spirit.* Is not he, to whom Chriſt here directs his Prayer, called *God?* and is he not diſtinguiſhed from the Son, who is called *the Meſſenger?* why then ſhould he not ſignify here *Perſonally*,

ly, God the Father, as well as in other places? why muſt *Father* here ſignify, *not the Father; but one Godhead, of which the Father is the Source?* Thus either his Obſervation is falſe; and then he is overthrown by the Texts to which he oppoſes it: or it is true; and then in this Text, *the only true God* is affirmed by our Saviour himſelf to be *the Father only*, in oppoſition to all other Perſons whomſoever. I cannot but admire this Author's way of expounding Scripture. One while, he ſounds Chriſt's Sonſhip on his eternal Generation; ſo that the title *Son* denotes *begotten Wiſdom* the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity: as ſoon as this notion will not ſerve the turn; as when the Son is (in St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark*) denied to know the Day and Hour of Judgment; then *the Son* ſhall ſignify Chriſt *Man*. Again, when God is diſtinguiſhed from the Son and Holy Spirit, he ſignifies *Perſonally* God the Father; this Notion ſhall ſerve us againſt many Socinian ſayings of Scripture, againſt all the Texts in the ſeventh Argument of the Hiſtory: But when *John* 17. 1, 3. and the like Texts are urged; then on the contrary, God the Father muſt not ſignify the Father Perſonally, but one Godhead, or Divinity, of which the Father is the Source. Certainly, were his Hypotheſis true, there would be no need he ſhould thus turn himſelf into all Shapes to defend it.

When the Father is called, *the one God*, and *the only true God*; in oppoſition to all falſe Gods: is he not ſo called in oppoſition to the Son alſo? Moſt certainly he is. In theſe two Texts, *John* 17. 3. 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. we have no warrant from Reaſon or Scripture, to underſtand by *the Father* Three Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. Is it not abſurd and ſenſeleſs to ſay, That *the Father* ſignifies alſo the Son and Holy Ghoſt, in thoſe very Texts where he is diſtinguiſhed from them? I always thought *the Father* ſignified, the Father only; and *the Son*, the Son only, and *Holy Ghoſt*, the Holy Ghoſt only. I always thought that the Language of Scripture, was agreeable to the Language of Men; becauſe otherways it cannot be underſtood by Men: and therefore that *Father* muſt not be underſtood to be Father and Son, and a third Perſon diſtinct from both. But Trinitarians, better ſighted than other People, have found, it may. When we read in Scripture, (1 *Cor.* 8. 6.) *To us there is but one God, the Father*: It ſounds as if the Apoſtle had ſaid; There is but one numerical infinite Being, the Father of Jeſus Chriſt, and of all the World; becauſe this is the natural Idea we have of *one God, the Father*. But this Author tells us, we are groſly miſtaken; for *one God* ſignifies three infinite Minds, three ſubſtantial intellectual Beings or Perſons. Again, we ſhould think that *the Father* here ſignifies *the Father only*: but this is (it ſeems) another foul Miſtake; for it ſignifies beſides the Father, a Son and an Holy Spirit different from both. Nay, we muſt not think that the very expreſs Words (at *Mat.* 24. 36.) *the Father only*, do indeed ſignify the Father only; but the Father, the Son, and another Perſon; even thô the Son is there expreſly ſaid not to know the Day and Hour of Judgment, and that *the Father only* knows it. Theſe are ſome of the Illuminations with which our Author and his Party has bleſt the World.

He goes on, and ſays; the Diſpute muſt end here, whether the Scripture does teach the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghoſt; for if ſo, when the Father is ſaid to be *the only true God*, and *the one God*; the Son and Holy Spirit are not hereby excluded from the Unity of the ſame Godhead. I anſwer, the Diſpute may be ſoon ended; for when the Father is called the one God, and the only true God, even in thoſe places where the Son is mentioned: This alone is a clear Demonſtration, that the Scripture does not teach the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghoſt. Were the Son and Holy Ghoſt God with the Father, the Prayer of our Lord (at *John* 17. 1, 2, 3, *&c.*) muſt have been thus framed; 'This is Life Eternal, to know 'Thee (Father) *and Me and the Holy Ghoſt* 'to be the only true God. And *Paul* to

the *Corinthians* ſhould have ſaid; 'But to 'us there is but one God, the Father, *the Son*, 'and *the Holy Ghoſt*. But this is the Language of Scripture, no where.

Pag. 186. 'His other Texts, ſaith our 'Author, prove no more but that the Father 'of Chriſt is God; not, that Chriſt is not 'one God with the Father. Let us hear the Texts themſelves, 1 Cor. 15. 24. *Then cometh the end, when he ſhall deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father.* James 3. 9. *Therewith bleſs we God, even the Father.* Rom. 15. 6. *That ye may with one Mind, and one Mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* It is an affected blindneſs and perverſeneſs, not to diſcern and own, that in theſe Texts, *God even the Father*, is as much as to ſay, *God, that is to ſay the Father.* No plainer or more expreſs Words could be uſed by a *Socinian* or other *Unitarian*, to declare his Notion of the Unity of God. What hope is there of convincing thoſe, with whom *the Father only* ſhall not ſignify the Father only? And again, *God, that is to ſay the Father*, ſhall be two others beſides the Father.

CHAP. V.

THE next Argument. 'If Chriſt were 'indeed God as well as Man; or (as 'Trinitarians ſpeak) *God the Son* Incarnate; 'it had been altogether ſuperfluous, to give 'the Holy Spirit to his ſaid Human Nature, 'as a Director and Guide: for what other 'help could that Nature need, which was 'one Perſon with (as they ſpeak) *God the Son*; 'and in which God the Son did Perſonally 'dwell? To this he anſwers: 'The account 'of this is plain and ſhort; for the whole 'Trinity is but one Energy and Power, and 'the Divine Perſons cannot act ſeparately *ad 'extra*: what the Father does, that the Son 'does, and that the Holy Ghoſt does by one 'Individual Act. But the Sanctification of 'all Creatures (and ſuch is the Human Na-'ture of Chriſt) is peculiarly attributed to 'the Holy Spirit. But if the whole Trinity is but one Energy and Power, the Sanctification of Chriſt's Human Nature (or of any other Creature) can by no means be peculiarly attributed to the Holy Ghoſt; why to the Holy Ghoſt rather than to the Father, or than to the Divine Word, or Son dwelling (as they ſay) after a peculiar manner in Chriſt? But the matter is plain, the Holy Ghoſt is the Power of God, of which Chriſt ſtood in need, for performing the Will and Works of the Father, and which God beſtowed on him for that very end; but if Chriſt had been indeed God, there had been no need he ſhould receive any ſuch Gift; for as God he would have had it, *in his own Perſon.* Our Author adds, 'He might as well have 'asked, why the Sanctification of the Church 'is aſcribed to the Spirit? But the Hiſtorian had no reaſon to ask ſuch a Queſtion: for no one pretends that the Church is God; or is Perſonally united either to the Father or Son, as *Trinitarians* ſay the Human Nature of Chriſt is.

It is after the ſame ſlight and inſignificant manner, that he anſwers the next Argument, even this; 'The Miracles of Chriſt are at-'tributed always, either to the Father, or the 'Holy Spirit dwelling in him. He anſwers (*pag.* 188.) *Father, Son and Holy Spirit act together.* I ſay now, ſuppoſing this which he ſays; yet if Chriſt were God, why ſhould we never aſcribe his Miracles to himſelf; why *always* to the Father, or to the Holy Spirit which is the Power of the Father? why has he concealed a matter of ſo great importance to be known? Or why do we ſeek to make him greater than he ever ſaid he was? Beſides,

ſides, in the very Texts, in which he aſcribes the Miracles he did, to the Father, or the Spirit and Power of the Father dwelling in him; I ſay in thoſe very Texts he denies, that he doth them himſelf: which is directly contrary to what our Author affirms, that the (pretended) three Divine Perſons have but one Energy, and act by one Individual Act. If that were ſo, our Saviour could not have ſaid, John 5. 30. *I can do nothing of my ſelf.* John 14. 10. *The Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the works.* Let us hear the account which St. *Peter* gives, Acts 10. 38. *God anointed Jeſus of* Nazareth *with the Holy Ghoſt, and with Power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppreſſed with the Devil: for God was with him.* Here St. *Peter* teaches, that Chriſt wrought all ſorts of Miracles, not becauſe (as *Trinitarians* ſay) he was God, but *becauſe God was with him*, i. e. God helped and aſſiſted him, by anointing him with the Holy Ghoſt, and with Power.

The next Argument is, ‘ Had our Lord ‘ Chriſt been more than a Man, the Prophe- ‘ cies of the Old Teſtament in which he is ‘ promiſed, would not deſcribe him barely ‘ as *the Seed of the Woman, the Seed of Abraham*, ‘ a Prophet like unto *Moſes*; the Servant and ‘ Miſſionary of God, on whom God's Spirit ‘ ſhould reſt. The Hiſtorian by a particular Induction of Texts, ſhews this to be the Character of Chriſt in the Prophecies of the Old Teſtament. Our Author thinks fit to anſwer this Objection, in another place.

I come now to his Anſwers, which he makes to the Arguments againſt the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt.

The Firſt Argument in the Hiſtory, is this; ‘ The Holy Ghoſt or Spirit, and the Power of ‘ God, are in Scripture ſpoken of as one ‘ and the ſame thing. Our Author anſwers, at *pag.* 189. ‘ It is as eaſy to prove, that the ‘ Father and Son are no Perſons, as that the ‘ Holy Spirit is none. But if he can make good this Aſſertion, *erit mihi magnus Apollo.* The Father has in the New Teſtament the Title of God, therefore becauſe God is moſt certainly a Perſon, no Body can doubt that the Father is a Perſon. As for the Son, the ſame Goſpel often ſays he is a Man; every Man being a Perſon; the Son being a Man, muſt be alſo a Perſon. But it is quite otherways with the Holy Ghoſt, for the Scriptures call it *the Power* of God; and Power is a Faculty, not a Perſon. Acts 10. 38. *God has anointed Jeſus of* Nazareth *with the Holy Ghoſt, and with Power.* Luke 1. 35. *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee, and the Power of the Higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee.* What is more plain than that, *the Power of the Higheſt* in theſe Texts is the explication of *the Holy Ghoſt?* Again, Acts 6. 5. *They choſe* Stephen, *a Man full of Faith, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* Ver. 8. *And* Stephen *full of Faith and of POWER, did great Wonders.* Here again the Holy Ghoſt at *ver.* 5. is explained by Power at *ver.* 8.

He ſays further; ‘ He is the Spirit of God, ‘ which ſearcheth the deep things of God; ‘ and he who knows all things in God, muſt ‘ be a knowing Mind. In anſwer to this, I muſt explain the Text to which he alludes, 1 *Cor.* 2. 10, 11. and which he cites too, *pag.* 192. Ver. 10. *But God has revealed them unto us by his Spirit; for the Spirit ſearches all things, yea the deep things of God.* The Apoſtle ſpeaks here of *the Doctrines of the Goſpel*, its Precepts and Promiſes, which before were hidden, but now are revealed to Men; as appears by *ver.* 7, 8, 9. He meaneth this; ‘ God has ‘ revealed to us Apoſtles theſe Doctrines, ‘ this (formerly) hidden Wiſdom, *by his In-* ‘ *ſpiration*; for this Spirit or Inſpiration in us ‘ ſearcheth out (*i. e.* finds or diſcovers) theſe ‘ deep or hidden things of God. Deep, I ‘ ſay, and hidden; not to us, but to the ‘ World, and the Princes of the World. The Apoſtle illuſtrates his Diſcourſe with a Compariſon, ver. 11. *What Man knoweth the things of a Man, ſave the Spirit of a Man which is in him? Even ſo the Things of God knoweth no Man, but the Spirit of God.* As if he had ſaid, As *no Man* knows the things that belong to Human Life, but by his own Spirit or Mind: So *no Man* knows theſe things of God, but by God's Spirit or Inſpiration, whereby he is enabled to know them. This Interpre-

tation perfectly agrees with what follows, at ver. 12. *Now we have not received the Spirit of the World, but the Spirit of God, that we might know the things that are freely given us of God.*

This is the true Senſe of this place. For οὐδεὶς which we tranſlate *no Man*, muſt either be underſtood excluſively of God; or ſo as to include God alſo. If it includes God too, it will follow, that the Holy Spirit or Third Perſon of the Trinity, knows the Things of God, and that the Father and Son are altogether ignorant of them; which Conſequence, I am ſure, they will not allow. But if οὐδεὶς ſignifies *no Man* here (as moſt certainly it does) then *the Spirit of God* is to be underſtood of, *the Man who has received that Spirit or Inſpiration*; by aſſiſtance whereof he may attain to the knowledge of the moſt ſecret Counſels of God; as the Apoſtle explains it, in the very next Verſe. The Author grants, that Charity may be ſaid *to ſuffer long, and to be kind*, becauſe a charitable Man does ſo: then the Spirit of God may be ſaid *to know the Things of God*, becauſe ὁ πνευματικὸς, *He that is Spiritual* (as St. *Paul* ſtiles him, Ver. 15.) he that has the Spirit of God, does ſo. This *Vorſtius* rightly underſtood in his Notes upon this place. 'By *the Spirit of God* (ſaith he) we 'muſt underſtand *that Spirit which is given* 'us of God; that is, our Selves as Spiritual: 'thus (*John* 3. 6.) *That which is born of the* 'Spirit, ſaith our Saviour, *is Spirit.* This I hope may be enough to clear the ſenſe of this Text.

But the Author cannot allow of Power and Inſpiration, diſtinct from God, and yet not God; *for what are Faculties in us, are Perſons in God.* If this be true, then there are more than Three Perſons in the Godhead; for *Power* is a Faculty in us, and being in God too, it muſt be another Perſon in him. Thus not only Wiſdom and Love, but Power alſo are Perſons in God. Nay, there being Three knowing Minds in the Godhead, each of which is God, as the Author tells us; it cannot be ſaid, that the Father only has Wiſdom, Love, and Power. The Son and the Holy Ghoſt muſt have them too; elſe they ſhould not be God. But if Wiſdom, Love and Power, being Faculties in us, ought to be Perſons in God: then there are Nine Perſons at the leaſt, in God, *viz.* Wiſdom, Love and Power in the Father, who is an Infinite Mind diſtinct from the Son and Holy Ghoſt; Wiſdom, Love and Power in the Son, who is an Infinite Mind diſtinguiſhed from the Father and Holy Ghoſt; Wiſdom, Love and Power in the Holy Ghoſt, who is an Infinite Mind diſtinct from the Father and Son. Moreover, he tells us, that the Son is a Perſon, *becauſe He is the Father's Reflex knowledge.* But the Son being an Infinite and moſt Perfect Mind, is undoubtedly able to reflect upon his own Wiſdom and Knowledg, and thus (as well as the Father) to beget a Son. And this ſecond Son in the Trinity may by the ſame Means and Reaſon beget another, and ſo onwards to Infinity. Thus according to this Maxim, that *what are Faculties in us, are Perſons in God*; there may be, nay there muſt be, an infinite number of Perſons in God. *Apage!*

'This is certain (ſays he) all Perſonal 'Acts belong to a Perſon; and therefore 'whatever has any Perſonal Acts, we muſt 'conclude is a Perſon: unleſs we know by 'ſome other means, that it is no Perſon, 'and then, that proves the Expreſſion to be 'Figurative. But we know, that the Holy Ghoſt is no Perſon; and therefore we may affirm, that whenever Perſonal Acts are aſcribed to it, it is to be figuratively taken. That the Holy Ghoſt is not God, we moſt certainly know; becauſe the Scripture plainly tells us, there is but one God, *the Father.* That the Holy Ghoſt is not *a created* Perſon, is made probable by ſeveral places of Scripture, which teach us, that it is God's Power and Inſpiration; *by explaining the Holy Ghoſt by the Power of God*, and putting one for the other. According to theſe two Principles, which the Scripture affords us; *viz.* That the Father only is God, and that the Holy Ghoſt is God's Power; we dare affirm, that

when

when Perſonal Acts are aſcribed to it, it is a Figurative Expreſſion. Thus we can eaſily conceive, that the Holy Ghoſt may be ſaid *to work Miracles* (pag. 190.) *to raiſe the Dead, to comfort, to convince, to ſanctify the Church, to dwell in the Church:* becauſe God by his Power works Miracles, raiſes the Dead, comforts, convinces, ſanctifies, and dwells in the Church. Thus we do not *prove* that the Holy Ghoſt is no Perſon, *only becauſe Perſonal Acts are ſometimes Figuratively attributed to that which is no Perſon; as this Author miſtakes:* But having proved by Scripture, that the Holy Ghoſt is no Perſon, we ſay that Perſonal Acts are figuratively aſcribed to it, as they are to Charity, Wiſdom, and other Things, both in Scripture and in Prophane Authors, and in common familiar Speech.

2. The ſecond Argument, againſt the Spirit's being God, is this; 'A manifeſt Di-'ſtinction is made, as between God and 'Chriſt; ſo alſo between God and the 'Holy Spirit, or Power and Inſpiration of 'God: ſo that 'tis impoſſible, the Spirit 'ſhould be God himſelf. To this our Author anſwers, *pag.* 191. 'This Holy Spirit is 'either a Divine ſubſiſting Perſon, or nothing 'but a Name. If this Spirit were a Divine 'Virtue or Power (as he would have it) 'then it is not diſtinct from God, but is God 'himſelf: As the Powers and Faculties of 'the Mind, thô they may be diſtinguiſhed 'from each other, yet they can't be any 'thing diſtinct from the Mind, but are the 'Mind it ſelf; and therefore if the Spirit, 'as he ſays, be repreſented in Scripture, 'as ſo diſtinct from God, that 'tis impoſſible 'he ſhould be God himſelf; then he muſt 'be a diſtinct Divine Perſon, and not the meer 'Power of God, which is not diſtinct from 'God himſelf. To this I anſwer; the Holy Spirit is neither a Divine ſubſiſting Perſon, nor a meer Name. In order to the clearing of this, I muſt obſerve, that the Holy Ghoſt ſignifies in Scripture, ſometimes the Power of God, ſometimes the Effects of that Power, or all miraculous extraordinary Gifts. In the firſt ſenſe, we read (*Luke* 1. 35.) *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee, and the Power of the Higheſt ſhall over-ſhadow thee.* Here it is evident that the Holy Ghoſt ſignifies the Power of God; whereby he effected the miraculous Conception of our Bleſſed Saviour. In the latter ſenſe, we read (*Gal.* 3. 5.) *He therefore that miniſtreth to you the Spirit, and worketh Miracles among you; doth he it by the Works of the Law, or by the hearing of Faith?* Here the Spirit is plainly meant of the miraculous Gifts, beſtowed upon the firſt Chriſtians; and the meaning of the Apoſtle's Queſtion is this; whether the *Galatians* had been indued with that Spirit, and thoſe extraordinary Gifts, by ſubmitting to the Ceremonial Law of *Moſes*, or only upon their imbracing the Goſpel? In the firſt ſenſe, the Holy Ghoſt is only *an Attribute* of God, and ſo is *not a meer Name*; nor is it a Divine ſubſiſting Perſon; which to ſay, were ridiculous, and contrary to the Notion of an Attribute. This Attribute may be diſtinguiſh'd from God, in ſuch manner *as Attributes are wont to be diſtinguiſh'd*; that is, God may be ſaid to act by his Power, as he is ſaid to act by his Wiſdom. But he ſaith, *If this Spirit were a Divine Vertue or Power, then it is not diſtinct from God, but is God himſelf.* I anſwer, if this be all our Author contends for, that the Holy Spirit (or Power) of God is God, in ſuch ſenſe as other Vertues and Faculties of God may be called God himſelf; the *Socinians* never denied it: and this is all that his Argument proves. Secondly, He ought to know, the Holy Spirit is not diſtinct from God, as one Perſon from another, but is diſtinguiſhed from God *as his Attribute.* This is eaſy and plain, and agreeable to Reaſon and Scripture: and is a full anſwer to what he adds, in theſe words; 'A Power which 'is diſtinct from God, and is not God him-'ſelf, as (he ſays) the Holy Spirit is, if it 'has any Perſonal Acts, muſt be a diſtinct 'Perſon: and if theſe Perſonal Acts are ſuch, 'as are proper only to God, it muſt be a 'diſtinct Divine Perſon.

He

He goes on. 'He ſays this Spirit is the 'Inſpiration of God; be it ſo. This Inſpi-'ration then, is either within God himſelf; 'or without him, in his Creatures who 'have this Inſpiration. If it be within God 'himſelf, it muſt be a Perſon, or elſe it 'cannot be diſtinct from God; and a Divine 'Perſon, unleſs any thing be in God, which 'is not God. If this Inſpiration be with-'out God, in the Creatures who are inſpi-'red by him; how is it the Spirit of God? 'For the Spirit of God muſt be in God, 'as the Spirit of a Man is in a Man? I an-'ſwer.

If every thing that is in God be a Perſon, then there muſt be as many Perſons in the Godhead, as there are *Attributes* or *Immanent Acts* in God; which to ſay, is too ſenſleſs and ridiculous, to need Confutation. God's Inſpiration as 'tis an Act, is in God; as 'tis an Effect, 'tis in Creatures; and is called the Spirit of God, becauſe 'tis an Effect of that Spirit, Energy or Power, which God uſes to make his Will known to Men, by inward Suggeſtion or Inſpiration.

He deſires to know (*pag.* 192.) how the Spirit of God differs from his Gifts and Graces? I anſwer; As the cauſe from its effects: ſo that *there are Diverſities of Gifts, but the ſame Spirit*, 1 Cor. 12. 4. The ſame Cauſe produces ſeveral effects, out of the ſame Power ſpring ſeveral Gifts.

3. The next Argument is; 'The Spirit 'is obtained of God by our Prayers, there-'fore it ſelf is not God. This he pretends to anſwer by his Old Sophiſm, that One Divine Perſon may ſend and give another; which has been already confuted. He adds; 'The Spirit gives himſelf, and is asked of 'himſelf; for the Divine Perſons in the 'Trinity do not act ſeparately: but as the 'Father and the Son give the Spirit; ſo 'the Holy Spirit gives himſelf *in the ſame 'Individual Act.* But how can this be the ſame Individual Act? The Father and the Son, ſays he, ſend the Holy Ghoſt, and the Holy Ghoſt gives himſelf. Can *ſending another*, and *giving one's ſelf*, be one and the ſame Act? Farther; If the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt cannot act ſeparately, when the Holy Ghoſt gives himſelf, Father and Son muſt give themſelves too; or elſe it will not be *the ſame Individual Act.* But were it ſo; this would not be made peculiar to the Holy Ghoſt, who only is ſaid (in Scripture) to be given and obtained of God. But the thing is plain and eaſy, if by the Spirit we underſtand God's Power and Inſpiration; which (with their Effects) are communicated to thoſe that pray for them.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

4. THE next Argument is againſt a Trinity of Perſons in the Godhead; 'Which (ſaith the Hiſtorian) is contrary 'to the whole Scripture. For that ſpeaks 'of God, but *as one Perſon*; and ſpeaks of 'him, and to him *by Singular Pronouns*; ſuch 'as *I, Thou, Me, Him*, &c. He cites alſo *Heb.* 1. 2. where Chriſt is called, the expreſs Image of God's Perſon. Our Author returns this Anſwer; 'It is plain that the Per'ſon, of whom the Son is called the expreſs 'Image, is the Perſon of God the Father; 'and the Father indeed is but one Perſon. But here he takes for granted, that the Son is the ſecond Perſon, of the Trinity; contrary to the Apoſtle, who ſpeaks only of *the Perſon of God*, not of the Perſon of God the Father diſtinct from the Perſon of God the Son. If the Perſon, of whom the Son is here ſaid to be the expreſs Image, is only the Perſon of the Father; then the Perſon of the Father only, *at ſundry Times and in divers Manners*, ſpake in times paſt to the Fathers by the Prophets, Ver. 1. for (Ver. 2.) the Son is called the Image of the ſame Perſon who ſpake to the Fathers at Ver. 1. But the Perſon of the Father only, is not the true God, in the Author's Hypotheſis; therefore he muſt conclude, that the true God ſpake not to the Fathers: which is a plain Contradiction to the Apoſtle; who ſays, that God (undoubtedly the true God) ſpake to the Fathers. Farther, by *God who ſpake to the Fathers*, we muſt underſtand either Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, or the Father only. If Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt ſpake to the Fathers; it could not be here ſaid, that Chriſt is the Image of that God's *Perſon*, for he is Three Perſons. If the Father only ſpake to the Fathers, then *the Father only* is the true God; for the true God ſpake to the Fathers; alſo then God is but one Perſon: Which are the things we contend for.

He goes on; 'As for his *Singular Pro'nouns, I, Thou*, &c. They prove indeed 'that there is but one God; as we all own: 'not, that there are not Three Perſons in 'the Godhead. But do not *Singular Pronouns* denote *Singular Perſons*, in all Languages? When therefore they are applied to God, they ſhow that he is a Singular (that is, but one) Perſon; unleſs they will ſay, that the Scripture is a particular Language different from all others: but this is falſe; for being written to Men, the Forms of ſpeaking and the Senſes of them, are the ſame as in all other Languages; and otherways the Scripture would not be given us, to inſtruct us, but to pervert and deceive us.

5. The fifth Argument. 'Had the Son 'or Holy Ghoſt been God; this would not 'have been omitted in the Apoſtles Creed. He anſwers; 'Had not the Son been God, 'and alſo the Holy Ghoſt, they would never 'have been put into the Apoſtles Creed; 'no more than the Form of Baptiſm, which 'is the Original of the Apoſtles Creed. But why not? Suppoſe the Son and Holy Ghoſt were not God; ſince *the Goſpel was preached by the One*, and *confirmed by the Other*; why may not they be put into the Creed, as well as *the Catholic Church*, by whom *the Goſpel is to be believed?* If our Creed only mentioned God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth; it would fit a Jew as well as a Chriſtian: therefore a Chriſtian Creed, *as ſuch*, muſt make mention of the Son and of the Holy Ghoſt, thô they are not Gods or God. A Chriſtian, *as ſuch*, muſt profeſs in his Creed, that he believes not only in God the Father Almighty; but alſo in his

Son.

Son Jesus Christ, who was sent by him to preach the Gospel; and in the Holy Ghost, by which it pleased God to confirm the truth of it: By such a Belief he is distinguished from a Jew or any other Man.

He adds. 'That the Primitive Christians 'did believe the Divinity of the Son and 'Holy Ghost, we are sufficiently assured 'from all the *Antient Records* of their Faith; 'but there was *no Reason* to express this in *so* 'short a Creed, before the *Arian* and *Socinian* 'Heresies had disturbed the Church. 'Tis plain, our Author has not read the Records of which he speaks. And whereas he says, there was *no reason* to express the Doctrine of the Trinity in the Creed; 'tis very marvellous to me, that there should be no reason to express an Article, which he and his Party say *is necessary to Salvation*; and that a Man is no Christian that believes it not. But he saith it was not necessary in *so short* a Creed; but I say, had the Article been necessary, (or so much as true) the Apostles and Primitive Church would have inlarged their Creed, to make room for a necessary Article; an Article much more necessary than the *Holy Catholick Church*, and other Articles there expressed. Besides, what Inlargement would it have been, what Incumbrance to the Learner's Memory, to have added twice this single and short Word, *God*; *And in* (*God*) *the Son, Jesus Christ our Lord*, &c. *I believe in* (*God*) *the Holy Ghost*, &c. as *Trinitarians* express themselves now a days? It is plain therefore, that the Apostles and Antient Church could have no other Reason, why in their Creed they made no mention of the Trinity, and the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost; no other, but that they believed it not. But why has our Author taken no notice of what the *Socinian* Historian had objected at *pag.* 22, 23, 24. was it too hot, or to heavy for him? Lastly; he says, *It needed not to be added*; *because the Son of God must be by Nature God*; *and the Spirit of God is as essentially God, as the Spirit of a Man is essential to a Man.* But must he that is the Son of God, be also by Nature God? St. *Luke* says of *Adam*, *who was the Son of God*, *Luke* 1. 38. Was *Adam* by nature God? Are not Angels in Scripture called *Sons of God*? and all good Christians are they not also Sons of God, in the Language of Scripture? *Job* 1. 6. and 38. 7. *John* 1. 12. 1 *John* 3. 2. For his other saying, that *the Spirit of God is as essentially God, as the Spirit of a Man is essential to a Man*: If one had leisure, there might be Answers enow made to it; all that I say, is, *I pray prove it.*

6. The Historian concludes, That, 'The '*Socinian* Faith is an accountable and reasonable Faith; but that of the *Trinitarians* is 'absurd, and contrary both to Reason, and 'to it self, and therefore not only false, but '*impossible*. On the contrary, our Author draws up against the *Socinian* System this Charge. '1. It ridicules the Scriptures. 2. It ridi'cules the whole Jewish Oeconomy. 3. It 'ridicules the Christian Religion. 4. It ju'stifies, at least excuses, both *Pagan* and '*Popish* Idolatries. If it be so, my Masters, the *Socinians* are ill Men indeed: but let us do them this Common Right, to examine what Proof there is of this Indictment.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

1. THE First pretence is, That 'The 'Socinian Doctrine ridicules the 'Scripture, by putting either a very abſurd 'or a very trifling Senſe on it, unworthy of 'the Wiſdom of God by whom it was in-'ſpired. He inſtances in ſome Expoſitions of Scripture, which he finds in the brief Hiſtory of the *Unitarians*. For Example,

The Hiſtorian, in anſwer to *Pſal.* 45. 6, 7. which the Apoſtle (at *Heb.* 1. 8.) applies to Chriſt, ſays, 'In the Hebrew and in the 'Greek 'tis, *God is thy Throne* (i. e. thy Seat, 'Reſting-place, *Eſtabliſhment*) *for ever*. Neither the Tranſlation nor the Interpretation is the Hiſtorian's, but by him taken out of *Grotius*, whom no Man thinks to have ridicul'd the Scripture. But let us ſuppoſe, contrary to *Grotius*, that the Hebrew *Elohim* ought to be taken in the Vocative Caſe, thus; *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*: Yet the Interpretation of *Grotius*, and of the Hiſtorian, affords neither an *abſurd* nor a *trifling* Senſe. The Words in the Pſalms are (by confeſſion of the ableſt *Trinitarian* Interpreters) ſpoken of *Solomon*, and are applied or accommodated to Chriſt, by the Apoſtle: and I think 'tis very good Senſe to ſay, that God was *the Reſting-place, Seat, or Eſtabliſhment*, both of Chriſt and *Solomon*. But (as I ſaid) let us grant, that the Words ſhould be thus rendered and interpreted, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*: I draw from thence this Inference, If *Solomon*, tho but a Man, is here ſtiled God; then Chriſt, who is a greater Man, may be called ſo too. But when he is here called God, it is not meant that he is *the Supream God*, unleſs the Supream God can be ſaid to be *anointed with the Oil of Gladneſs above his Fellows*, which is plainly inconſiſtent with the Notion of a Supream God. Beſides, he who is called God in this place, is ſaid to have *a God, by whom he is anointed*; which can by no means agree to the Supream God: for he can have no God above him, by whom he may be exalted, being himſelf the moſt High.

The Apoſtle in the following Verſes, cites another Paſſage out of *Pſal.* 102. 25, 26, 27. which (ſays our Author at *pag.* 201.) is a plain Teſtimony of the Divinity of our Saviour. The Words are theſe, *And thou Lord in the beginning haſt laid the Foundations of the Earth; and the Heavens are the works of thy Hands: they ſhall periſh, but thou remainſt, and they ſhall all wax old as does a Garment, and as a Veſture ſhalt thou fold them up, and they ſhall be changed: but thou art the ſame, and thy Years fail not.* Now, I ſay, that the Creation of the World cannot be aſcribed to Chriſt in this place. This, I prove, by the Scope of the Apoſtle in this whole Chapter, which is not to ſhew the Excellence which Chriſt has *of himſelf*, but that which he obtained by Donation, whereby he *was made* better than Angels, as appears by *ver.* 4. the Words are theſe, *Being MADE ſo much better than Angels, as he has by Inheritance obtained* (κεκληρονόμηκεν) *a more excellent Name than they.* The Greek Word which we tranſlate *obtained by Inheritance*, ſignifies no more than barely *obtained*; the Words *by Inheritance* are uſeleſs and dangerous, and falſe too, for the Name Chriſt has obtained, came to him by free Donation, not by Inheritance. And therefore it is that the moſt Famous Criticks render κεκληρονόμηκεν, by *obtinuit, ſortitus eſt*, he gained or obtained. I ſay therefore, the Apoſtle's Scope is to ſhow the Excellency that Chriſt obtained, not by Nature, or of Himſelf, but that which he had by Donation; and whereby he was made by God better than the Angels. Whereupon in this whole Chapter he oppoſes the Glory which Chriſt had been indued with,

to the Glory of Angels; and ſhews that His is more excellent and greater than Theirs. So that ſuppoſe Chriſt had indeed created the World, yet the Creation cannot be aſcribed to him in this Place; for if he had created the World, he ſhould have done it by a Power proper and eſſential to himſelf, not by a Power *received from another*. But the Apoſtle deſigns in this Chapter, not to ſpeak of what is natural or eſſential to Chriſt, but of what he has received from God, whereby he was *made greater* and more excellent than Angels.

Having thus ſhown, that Chriſt is not ſaid here to have created the World, I muſt now declare, in what Senſe this Text of the *Pſalm* is applied to him. The preceding Words, ſpoken of *Solomon*, are accommodated to him, to expreſs *the Glory and the Duration* of his Kingdom: its Glory, becauſe *God has anointed him with the Oil of Gladneſs above his Fellows*; its Duration, becauſe *his Throne is for ever and ever*. By which glorious and laſting Kingdom, Chriſt has been made much better than Angels, and obtained a more excellent Name than they: which (as I ſaid before) is the thing, the Apoſtle in this Chapter intended to teach us. Now to the ſame purpoſe he applies to Chriſt another place, taken out of *Pſal.* 102. and ſeparated from the other only by the Word *And:* by this other place (or rather, in the Words and Terms of this other place) he confirms what he ſaid before concerning the Duration of Chriſt's Kingdom; and ſhews that tho all things be ſubject to change and alteration, yet Chriſt's Kingdom ſhall be immutable and laſt for ever. *They* (the Heavens and the Earth) *ſhall periſh, but thou remaineſt; and they all ſhall wax old as does a Garment, and as a Veſture ſhalt thou fold them up, and they ſhall be changed; but thou art the ſame, and thy Years fail not.* Theſe Words are uſed as a Confirmation of what went before, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever.* As for ver. 10. *Thou Lord in the beginning haſt laid the Foundation of the Earth*, &c. The Apoſtle does not cite it as ſpoken of Chriſt, or with intention to accommodate it to him; but becauſe it was neceſſary for explaining the word, *They* (*They ſhall periſh*) in the following words, which he had occaſion to uſe for expreſſing *the Duration* of Chriſt's Kingdom. And now I appeal to any Reader, whether this be *an abſurd* Senſe? Is not this Explication clear, and agreeable to the Scope of the Sacred Writer? But is not the Senſe which the Author would put upon this place, both abſurd and inconſiſtent? Can it be ſaid that Chriſt is *made better* than Angels, and obtained a greater Name than they, becauſe he created Heaven and Earth; that is, being ſo before *by Nature*, and from all Eternity, he is afterwards *made better*, and has a more excellent Name than theirs *beſtowed* on him?

The next place he examines, is *Pſal.* 68. 18. *Thou haſt aſcended on high, thou haſt led Captivity Captive, thou haſt received Gifts for Men:* Which St. *Paul* applies to Chriſt. Whereupon our Author ſays, 'The ſingle Queſtion is, Whether Chriſt be that God of whom the Pſalmiſt ſays, that *He aſcended on High? &c.* If he be not, St. *Paul* has abuſed us, for he applies that to Chriſt, which was not ſaid of him. Here indeed is a very raſh Concluſion. Were this true, it would follow, that the Sacred Writers of the New Teſtament have abuſed us, as often as they have cited any place of the Old Teſtament *by way of accommodation*. Thus St. *Paul* has again abuſed us, when he applies (at *Rom.* 10. 18.) to the Apoſtles theſe Words, *Their ſound went out into all the Earth, and their Words into the ends of the World*; which every one knows and confeſſes are meant (at *Pſal.* 19. 4.) of the Heavens and other Works of God, which (as it were) preach his Wiſdom and Power and Goodneſs to all Nations. And thus St. *Matthew* (at *Mat.* 13. 35.) puts a Trick upon us, when he applies to Chriſt the Words of Pſal. 78. 2. *I will open my Mouth in Parables:* Which the Pſalmiſt ſpeaks of himſelf, not of Chriſt. Is our Author ſo little acquainted with the Writers of the New Teſtament, as to be ignorant, that they very often cite the Texts of the Old, not as Teſtimonies and Proofs of what they ſay, but by

way

way of Alluſion and Accommodation? Such is the place in queſtion, the Apoſtle thought fit to accommodate the words of the Pſalm, to the matter he was treating of; which was an elegant way of writing, and very much practiſed by the Antient Jews, as may be ſeen both in the Talmud and Rabbins. Let us hear *J. Calvin* on this place; 'Laſtly, ſays he, 'we muſt not be too ſcrupulous about the Li-'teral Senſe of this Pſalm; ſeeing the Apoſtle 'only alludes to the Pſalmiſt's words: even as 'he applies a place of *Moſes*, to the matter in 'hand at *Rom.* 10. 6.

'God himſelf can be no Type, ſays our 'Author, *pag.* 203. for the Type is always 'leſs perfect than the Anti-type; and there-'fore whatſoever is ſaid of God, muſt be-'long to his Perſon, and cannot belong to 'any other. But what then? We do not ſay that God is a Type of any other in this Text; nor did the Apoſtle cite the Words as ſuch: we only ſay, that what is ſpoken of God in the *Pſalm*, is by the Apoſtle applied to Chriſt by way of Accommodation; as ſeveral other Paſſages of the Old Teſtament are, both by him and other ſacred Writers; as is confeſt by all Interpreters.

The next Place is *Heb.* 1. 6. *When he bringeth the Firſt-begotten into the World, he ſays; and let all the Angels of God worſhip him:* Which laſt Words are commonly thought to be quoted out of *Pſal.* 97. 7. To this Allegation the Socinian Hiſtorian anſwers; 'The Apoſtle does not quote the Words of 'the Pſalmiſt, as if they were ſpoken of 'Chriſt; but only declareth the Decree of 'God (known to him by the Spirit) for 'ſubjecting the Angels to Chriſt, in the 'ſame Words that the *Pſalmiſt* had uſed on 'another Occaſion. This is a very ſound and judicious Anſwer; yet our Author cannot reſt ſatisfied with it, for he anſwers; 'But he proves this Decree of God by no 'other Revelation, but the Words of the 'Pſalmiſt, nor pretends any other; and if 'that don't prove it, we have no other. Yes, we have; for we know from Chriſt himſelf, that *all Power is given to him, both in Heaven and Earth*, and conſequently that he is exalted above all the Orders of Angels: this the Scriptures often teach, and it was believed by all Chriſtians in the time of the Apoſtles. So that when this ſacred Writer ſets before the *Hebrews* the eminent Glory of Chriſt; he does it, only to keep them in mind of it, and to perſwade them never to depart from the Doctrine of ſo great and glorious a Maſter. As if he ſhould have ſaid; 'You are not ignorant of the Glory 'Chriſt now injoys *in Heaven*; how Thrones, 'Powers, Dominions, *&c.* are ſubjected to 'him: for when God brought his Firſt-born 'and beloved Son into *the Heavenly World*, 'he ſaid concerning him, what had been 'ſaid upon another Occaſion, *Let all the 'Angels of God worſhip him*; let them honour, 'ſerve, and be ſubject to him. This is the true and natural Senſe of this Place; to which I muſt add, (what has been already obſerved by others) that it is probable this Place is quoted out of *Deut.* 32. 43. according to the Lxx; and not out of *Pſal.* 97. For there we find the very Words of the Apoſtle, καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ, *And let all the Angels of God worſhip him.* But in *Pſal.* 97. we find only, *Worſhip him all ye Gods.* If this be true, as I think it is, our Author's Objection will fall of it ſelf. For thoſe Words in *Deut.* are not ſpoken of God, but of God's People, the *Iſraelites.* And if this can be ſaid of God's People; I hope it may be ſaid of Chriſt too, without concluding from thence, that he is the Supream God.

The next Place is *Iſa.* 45. 23. *I have ſworn by my ſelf; Unto me every Knee ſhall bow.* Which Words of God are applied to Chriſt at *Rom.* 14. 10, 11. *We ſhall all ſtand before the Judgment Seat of Chriſt; for it is written, Every Knee ſhall bow to me, and every Tongue ſhall confeſs to God.* To this the Hiſtorian anſwers; 'In bowing and confeſſing to 'Chriſt at the laſt Judgment, we are ſaid 'to bow and confeſs to God; not becauſe 'Chriſt is God, but becauſe Chriſt then and 'there holds the place of God, repreſent-

'eth him, and acteth by his Commiſſion. 'So Men are ſaid to appear before our So-'raign Lord the King, when they appear at 'the Bar of his Judges; becauſe the Judges 'act in the King's ſtead, and by his Com-'miſſion. To this our Author replies; 'But why does he confine this bowing the 'Knee *to the laſt Judgment?* St. *Paul*, in-'deed gives this as one Inſtance, but does 'not confine it to this; but in the Epiſtle 'to the *Philippians* makes it as large, as the 'Exaltation of our Saviour; *Wherefore God 'hath highly exalted him*, &c. And one may plainly ſee, that the Hiſtorian does not confine the bowing of the Knee *to the laſt Judgment*; He only explains the Words of the Apoſtle which relate to it. But what then? The Apoſtle makes the bowing of the Knee as large as Chriſt's Exaltation, *Phil.* 2. What follows from thence? That Chriſt is God! By no means. It follows only, that we ought to pay Chriſt an Honour proportionable to the Dignity beſtowed on him; in a word, that every Tongue confeſs that he is *Lord, to the Glory of God, the Father.* In which Words the Apoſtle plainly teaches us, that the Honour we pay to Chriſt, is ſubordinate to God, and deſigned to promote *God's* Glory.

'If then, ſays he, we muſt bow to the 'Perſon of Chriſt, and confeſs him to be 'the Lord, and this can be an Accompliſh-'ment of God's Oath, *Unto me every Knee 'ſhall bow, and every Tongue ſhall ſwear*; then 'Chriſt is that God, who in the Prophet '*Iſaiah* ſwore, That every Knee ſhould bow 'to him. This is juſt as if one ſhould ſay; If then the Iriſh muſt bow to the Perſon of the *Vice-Roy* in *Ireland*, and confeſs him to be the Lord; and this be the Accompliſhment of the King's Will, *Unto me all the Iriſh ſhall bow, and ſwear Allegiance*; then the *Vice-Roy* is that King, who will have all the Iriſh to ſwear Allegiance to him. This is a ridiculous Argument; for as the Iriſh may bow to the Perſon of the *Vice-Roy*, and look upon him as *a Lord* eſtabliſhed by the King to govern *Ireland*; ſo this they do in compliance with the King's Will, and to ſhew thereby that they are his loyal and faithful Subjects: and he who bows to the *Vice-Roy*, may be ſaid to bow to the King; becauſe the *Vice-Roy* repreſents the King, and acts in his Name. So that it would be non-ſenſe to ſay, the *Vice-Roy* is King, becauſe they pay him that Honour. Let us apply this to Chriſt; we muſt bow to him, and confeſs him to be the *Lord*; and by ſo doing, God's Oath is accompliſhed, *Unto me every Knee ſhall bow*, &c. Does it follow from thence, that Chriſt is that God, who ſwore in the Prophet *Iſaiah?* Not at all; becauſe when we pay this Honour to Chriſt, it is, to obey God's Commands, and to acknowledg his Power and Authority over us. He who honours the Ambaſſador, honours him that ſent him; he who honours Chriſt God's Anointed, honours God who anointed him. In a word, He who bows to Chriſt thô a Man, bows to God alſo.

The next place, is *Rom.* 9. 33. *As it is written, Behold I lay in* Sion *a ſtumbling-Stone, and Rock of offence; and whoſoever believeth on him, ſhall not be aſhamed.* Part of theſe Words are taken from *Iſa.* 28. 16. and becauſe they are ſpoken of God in the Prophet, and applied to Chriſt by St. *Paul* and St. *Peter*, as ſeveral other Texts of the Old Teſtament are: They conclude, Chriſt muſt be that God, ſpoken of in the Prophet. But the Hiſtorian anſwers; that 'Neither *Peter*, 'nor *Paul*, cite the Words of the Prophet, 'as ſpoken of Chriſt; but *only as in ſome 'ſenſe applicable to him*, namely, becauſe Chriſt 'alſo was to many a Stone of ſtumbling. To this our Author replies, like a Man very little acquainted with Scripture: 'that 'This is nothing elſe, but to charge the 'Apoſtles with abuſing Scripture; and pro-'ducing Proofs, which are no Proofs. This I have anſwered before. But he tells us, that 'Paul alledges this Prophecy to prove, 'that the Infidelity of the Jews, and the 'Offence they ſhould take at Chriſt, was 'foretold in Scripture. Here I muſt tell him, he is miſtaken. For the Words are

no

no ſuch Prophecy; but are ſpoken of the Times of *Sennacherib*, who was to make War againſt the Inhabitants of *Jeruſalem*, whom God promiſes to protect and defend, if they will but keep within the Walls of the City, and ſtick cloſe to his Law. The Author adds a conſiderable Reflection; 'And thus theſe Men, rather than they will 'allow the Scripture proofs, that Chriſt is 'God, deſtroy all the Old Teſtament proofs 'of the Truth of Chriſtianity; and yet if 'ſuch Texts as theſe, muſt paſs only for 'Accommodations and Alluſions, I know 'not where they will find any proofs. Alas! I perceive the Author would be a very unfit Man to convert Jews. When I read firſt this Paſſage of his Book; I could not but wonder, how it came from a Chriſtian. He knows not where we may find any proofs of Chriſtianity, beſides thoſe of the Old Teſtament. Are then the Miracles of Chriſt, and of his Apoſtles, nothing? Is Chriſt's Reſurrection no Proof, or but a weak one, of his being ſent by God, and the truth of his Meſſage? Muſt we account as nothing, the Purity of the Goſpel, and its ſwift Propagation thrô the whole World? I always thought, with other Chriſtians, that theſe were invincible Arguments for the Truth of our Religion. So they are indeed, and by them we ought to convince the Jews: and then we are able to give them a reaſonable Account of all the Texts of the Old Teſtament, that are quoted in the New.

The firſt place in the New Teſtament, quoted by our Author, is *Mat.* 28. 19. *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations; Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* This the Author of the *Brief Hiſtory* explains, after this manner: 'To be Baptized in the Name of a Perſon 'or Perſons, is a Rite by which one delivers 'himſelf to the Inſtitution, Inſtruction, and 'Obedience of ſuch Perſon or Perſons. So 'that to be Baptized in the Name of the 'Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; is to pro-'feſs to be led and guided by them: or '(as *Grotius* expreſſes this matter) 'tis to 'declare, we will admit of no other thing 'as a part of our Religion, but what pro-'ceeds from theſe; that is, Nothing but 'what is *commanded by God*, or the Father, 'and has been *delivered by his Son* the Lord 'Chriſt, and *confirmed* (externally, by the 'Miracles; and internally, by the Witneſs 'and Teſtimony) *of the Spirit*, that is, of 'the Power and Inſpiration of God. Now all this our Author grants; only he ſays, that 'Baptiſm being a Religious Rite, it is 'a Religious Profeſſion of this; a Religious 'Devoting our ſelves to them: and there-'fore we give up our ſelves to their Inſti-'tution and Guidance, not as Creatures, but 'as to God; who is both the Author and 'Object of our Faith and Worſhip. But what is the meaning of all this? We do not deny, that Baptiſm is a Religious Rite, and a Religious Profeſſion of our Faith: we only deny that, becauſe we are Baptized in the Name of the Son and Holy Ghoſt, as well as in the Name of the Father, that therefore the Son and Holy Ghoſt, are Two Divine Perſons, and God as well as the Father. We religiouſly profeſs in Baptiſm, to believe no other Doctrine but what is derived from the Father, taught by his Son, and confirmed by the Holy Ghoſt; and the being Baptized in the Name of the Son and Holy Ghoſt, is ſo far from proving, that they are God; that ſuppoſing they are not, yet we muſt of neceſſity be Baptized in their Name. When the Apoſtles made Proſelytes, had they Baptized them only in the Name of the Father; ſuch a Baptiſm had been no diſtinction of Chriſtians from Jews; for the Jews believed in the true God, as well as the Chriſtians. So that ſuppoſing Chriſt and the Holy Ghoſt are not God, yet ſince the Goſpel was firſt preached by the One, and confirmed by the Other; it was neceſſary that he who imbraced the Goſpel, ſhould be Baptized in the Name of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt: to profeſs thereby, that he was neither a Jew nor a Pagan, but a Chriſtian; and that he

he admitted no other Doctrine, but that delivered by the Son, and confirmed by the Holy Ghoſt. This was ſo eſſential to the Baptiſm of a Chriſtian, that we never read in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, that Proſelytes were baptized in the Name of the Father, but *only in the Name of the Son*: of which we can give a reaſonable Account; for all that believed *in God*, did not believe in Chriſt; but whoever believed in Chriſt, believed in God too. One might believe and truſt *in God*, without being a Chriſtian; but whoever believed in Chriſt and was Baptized in his Name, was both a Worſhipper of the true God, and a Chriſtian. He who was Baptized in the Name of the Son, did publickly profeſs this Belief, that he was ſent from God, and had his Doctrine from him; and by ſuch an Acknowledgment he profeſt at the ſame time, that God bare teſtimony to this Doctrine by the plentiful effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt: So that to be Baptized in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; and to be Baptized only in the Name of the Son; are one and the ſame thing. I ſhall conclude this, with the Words of the Learned Mr. *Limborck*, Theol. Chriſt. *pag.* 645. *Dominus Jeſus ritui*, &c. in Engliſh thus; 'To this Rite before 'practiſed by *John Baptiſt*, the Lord Jeſus 'added another Signification; *viz.* the Pro-'feſſion of his Name, and the Publick Re-'ception of the Doctrine he had preached. 'Therefore he ordered that Baptiſm ſhould 'be adminiſtred *in the Name of the Father, the 'Son, and the Holy Ghoſt*, Mat. 28. 19. That 'thoſe who ſhould receive the Rite of Bap-'tiſm, might thereby give up themſelves 'to the Father, the Son, and the Holy 'Ghoſt; and profeſs themſelves Diſciples of 'that Doctrine, which is originally derived 'from the Father, revealed and preached 'by the Son, and confirmed by the Holy 'Ghoſt, with divers Miracles, Signs, Pro-'digies, and Diſtributions of Giſts. So that 'the Reception of Baptiſm, was *a publick 'Profeſſion of the Doctrine of Chriſt*. There-'fore it is, that the Faithful are ſaid every 'where, to be *Baptized in the Name of Chriſt*; 'that is, to profeſs by their being Baptized, 'that they receive his Doctrine as Divine, 'and will be called by his Name, as being 'their heavenly Maſter and only Saviour.

The Hiſtorian adds, that, 'Tis in vain, 'not to ſay ridiculouſly pretended; that a 'Perſon or thing is God, becauſe we are 'Baptized *unto it*, or *in the Name of it*. For 'then *Moſes*, and St. *John Baptiſt* alſo, would 'be Gods. 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2. *Our Fathers 'were all Baptized unto* Moſes. Acts 19. 3. '*Unto what then were ye baptized? And they 'ſaid, unto* John's *Baptiſm*; that is (ſay 'the Generality of Interpreters) *unto John*, 'and the Doctrine by him delivered. He replies *pag.* 212. 'I confeſs he had anſwered 'this Argument; could he have ſhewn us, 'that the Jews were baptized in the Name 'of God, and in the Name of *Moſes*, *for 'that had joined* Moſes *with God*, as our Sa-'viour joins the Son and Holy Ghoſt with 'the Father in the form of Baptiſm. But if the Jews were baptized in the Name of *Moſes*; who can doubt, that they were baptized in the Name of God too; as thoſe who are baptized in the Name of Jeſus, are *thereby* baptized alſo in the Name of God, as has been before ſhewed? It is plain, the Apoſtle compares *Moſes* with Chriſt; and tells the *Corinthians*, that, as they were baptized in the Name of Jeſus the Son and Meſſenger of God, ſo the Fathers had been baptized in the Name of *Moſes* the Servant of God. But we can afford the Author ſome places of Scripture, wherein *Creatures are joined with God*. Thus, *Exod.* 14. 31. it is ſaid; *And the People feared the Lord, and believed the Lord, and his Servant* Moſes. In the Hebrew 'tis, *in* the Lord and *in Moſes* his Servant. Here *Moſes the Man* is joined with God; and the Jews are ſaid, to *believe in* him, as they believed *in* God. So 1 *Tim.* 5. 21. *I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the elect Angels, that thou obſerve theſe things*, &c. Here elect Angels, tho' Creatures, are ranked with God in ſo great and important a Matter, and act of Religion,

Religion, as an *Obtestation*. Again, *Rev.* 1. 4. *Grace be to you and Peace from him, which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits which are before his Throne.* If *Moses* and Angels may be joined with God, in Acts of *Faith*, of *Obtestation*, and of *Benediction*; why not the Son and Spirit in *Baptism*, thô neither of them is God himself? We plainly see by St. *Paul*'s Words to the *Corinthians*, that to be baptized *in the Name of One*, does not import that he is God. 1 Cor. 1. 14, 15. *I thank God*, says he, *I baptized none of you, but* Crispus *and* Gaius; *lest any should say, that I had baptized in my own Name.* He plainly intimates, that a meer Man may baptize in his own Name; and if any of the *Corinthians* had thought so of the Apostle, I hope they would not have concluded from thence, that he was God, or made himself God.

He adds; 'It is plain, that to baptize 'unto *Moses*, is a Figurative and Allusive 'Expression; and does not and cannot sig-'nify, that they were baptized in the Name 'of *Moses*; because it is not true. Indeed the Jews were not baptized as Christians are; but still they were baptized. Let the Author call it a Figurative and Mystical Baptism, or what else he pleases; it was still a Baptism, as St. *Paul* assures us. And to be baptized *into Moses*, is the same with being baptized *in the Name of* Moses; as in the New Testament to be baptized *into* or *unto* Christ, is the same with being baptized *in the Name of* Christ. This was rightly understood by *Vorstius*, who paraphrases this place thus; *Scitis etiam*, &c. *i. e.* 'You know also, that they were all 'baptized in the Doctrine of *Moses*, as the 'Messenger of God; as the Cloud, and the 'Passage thrô the Red-Sea were designed 'for a Confirmation of the Ministry of '*Moses*.

But he denies, that, to be baptized *into* Christ, and baptized *in the Name of* Christ, signify the same thing. But he mistakes as grossly, as he uses to do; for any one may observe it, that compares the Texts, where these Phrases are used. Thus, *John* 3. 18. *He that believeth on him* (in the Greek, εἰς αὐτὸν, or *into*, or *unto him*) *is not condemned; but he that believeth not, is condemned already; because he hath not believed in the Name of the only begotten Son of God.* So at *Rom.* 6. 3. and *Gal.* 3. 27. to be baptized *into* Christ; and at *Acts* 2. 38. and 8. 16. to be baptized *in the Name of* Christ, are used as equivalent terms. Indeed, the plain meaning of *Rom.* 6. 3. is this; 'Know ye not, that 'so many of us as were baptized in the 'Name of Christ, and profest to obey his 'Doctrine, lay thereby under an Obliga-'tion of a Spiritual Conformity to his Death; 'in dying to Sin, as he is dead; and living 'to God, as he is raised from the dead 'and lives with God. So that the first words, contrary to our Author's Assertion, relate to the form of administring Baptism in the Name of Jesus; and the latter to the effect of it. This we may apply also to *Gal.* 3. 27.

He further denies, That to be baptized *unto*, or *into* John's *Baptism*, signifies to be baptized in the Name of *John*: for (says he) *John* did not baptize in his own Name; but made Proselytes to the *Messias*. But I hope he will not deny, that to be baptized *into Christ's Baptism* is all one with being baptized *in the Name of Christ*. And if this be so, to be baptized *into* John's *Baptism*, must also signify to be baptized *in the Name of* John. *John* indeed made Proselytes to the *Messias*; but he preached the Doctrine of Repentance, and he who was baptized by him, was baptized into the Profession of the Doctrine taught by him; and therefore, whoever profest in his Baptism, to follow the Doctrine of *John*, might be said to be baptized to the Doctrine of *John*, or in the Name of *John*.

Lastly, He asks, Whether it be not very absurd, that the Power or Inspiration of God, which is not a Person, should be joined *in the same Form* with the Father and Son, who are Persons? I answer; I see no absurdity, in being baptized into the Profession of

a-

a Doctrine, which not only comes originally from God the Father, and is revealed by his Son, but is confirmed by the Power or Spirit of God.

The next and last Place of the New Teſtament, which our Auther conſiders, is the firſt Chapter of St. *John*'s *Goſpel:* Which, ſays he, *pag.* 215. gives a glorious Teſtimony to the Divinity of Chriſt; and a plain Demonſtration of the incurable Perverſeneſs of Hereticks. I will examine this High Pretence; and ſhew theſe three Things. 1. The Abſurdity of the Author's Explication of this Chapter. 2. The Inconſiſtency of the Trinitarian Hypotheſis with the Context. 3. The true ſenſe and meaning of this ſo much controverted Place.

1. The Hiſtorian ſaid, that the *Trinitarian* Expoſition of this Chapter is abſurd and contradictious, and that it is this; ' *In the Be-* ' *ginning*, i. e. from all Eternity. But, How (ſaith the Hiſtorian) can *in the Beginning*, be *from all Eternity?* From all Eternity is *before* the Beginning, or *without* Beginning, not *in* the Beginning. To this our Author replies, That *No Man expounds in the beginning of Eternity.* But he ſhould not be ſo bold in his Aſſertions; for Mr. *Calvin* expounds it ſo. He adds; ' When St. *John* tells us, *In the Beginning was* ' *the Word*; we ſay this proves the Eternity ' of the Word: for that which *was*, when ' all things began which had a beginning, was ' it ſelf before the beginning and without ' beginning. I anſwer, had the Evangeliſt deſigned to teach us the Eternity of the Word; he would undoubtedly have done it by the ſame Characters, that are uſed in Scripture to expreſs the Eternity of God. Now this Expreſſion, *in the Beginning*, is ſo far from denoting Eternity, that it is never applied to God in that Senſe. We read in Scripture, That *In the Beginning God created Heaven and Earth*, Gen. 1. 1. Heb. 1. 10. a plain Demonſtration that *In the beginning* cannot be applied to him that is God, but only to Creatures; and as plain a Demonſtration that God himſelf is from all Eternity; for he who created all things, muſt needs be (not only before all things, but) from Eternity. But we never read *God was in the Beginning*, in all the Deſcriptions which the Scriptures afford us of his Eternity: nay, they rather declare it or deſcribe it by *Before the beginning*, Pſal. 90. 2. *Before the Mountains were brought forth*; —— *even from everlaſting to everlaſting thou art God.* Here Eternity is deſcribed by *before the beginning.* This is the Scripture-Notion of Eternity: therefore if St. *John* had intended to ſhew the Eternity of the Word, he ſhould not have ſaid *In the beginning was the Word*; but as 'tis ſaid of God, *In the beginning the Word created the Heaven and the Earth.* Nor will it avail any thing to ſay; ' The Word was ſo in the beginning; that *all things were* ' *made by him*; *and without him was not any* ' *thing made that was made.* For as the foregoing Words, *In the beginning was the Word*, are no true Deſcription of Eternity in Scripture; ſo neither are theſe, *All things were made by him, &c.* the Scripture-Deſcription of the Creation. There is no mention here made either of the Heaven, or the Earth, or the Sea, which are never omitted in the Deſcriptions we have in Scripture of the firſt and true Creation, a I ſhewed before; and therefore there is no need to inſiſt longer on this Phraſe in this place.

The Hiſtorian goes on. ' *Was the Word*, ' i. e. *was God the Son?* But where in Scrip- ' ture, ſays he, is the Word called God the ' the Son? Our Author replies: ' This *Word* ' indeed is God the Son; but we do not pa- ' raphraſe it ſo in this place, *In the beginning* ' *was God the Son:* but, *In the beginning was* ' *that Divine Perſon who is called the Word.* But I pray, what is the meaning of this? For if the Word is indeed God the Son, one may paraphraſe it here, In the beginning was God the Son; as well as, In the beginning was that Divine Perſon called the Word: the one is as fit, and as good Senſe as the other. But it ſeems, our Author is aſham'd to paraphraſe *the Word*, by *God the Son:* this is a Modeſty in him, which is but ſeldom found in his Book.

Hiſtor.

Histor. ‘ *The Word was God*, i. e. The ‘ Son was with the Father. *Answ.* It seems ‘ then that God in this Clause, is the Father. ‘ But was not the Son also with the Holy ‘ Ghost, and is not he too (according to ‘ *Trinitarians*) God, or a God? If he is, why ‘ does St. *John* only say, the Son was with ‘ the Father; and how comes the Father to ‘ ingross here the Title of God, to the ex‘ clusion of the Holy Ghost? To avoid the strength of this Argument, our Author replies; ‘ By *God*, the Apostle here means ‘ that Original Mind and Wisdom, that Su‘ pream and Soveraign Being, whom all ‘ Men called God, without making a Distin‘ ction of Persons in the Godhead. But if *God* in this place does not signify the Father only, but the Three Persons of the Trinity; he should not tell us, that the Apostle here means that Original Mind and Wisdom, but *those Three Minds whom all Men called God*; for we are taught all over his Book, that God is Three infinite Minds; and consequently Three Wisdoms, for an infinite Mind cannot be without Wisdom: Neither should he say, *That Supream and Soveraign Being*, whom all Men call God, but those Three Supream and Soveraign Beings: for he often tells us, that *God is Three infinite and substantial Beings*; therefore he is Three Supream and Soveraign Beings. It is a plain Contradiction, to say in one place, God is Three Minds and Three Beings; and in another, that he is but one Mind and one Being. Furthermore, when the Evangelist says, *The Word was with God*, if by God he means not the Father only, but the Three Persons who are that God; this will make a very trifling sense. For then, *the Word was with God*, must signify, the second Person of the Trinity was with the Three Persons of the Trinity, and consequently with himself; which is not only trifling, but ridiculous.

The Apostle adds; *And the Word was God.* Our Author to serve his Hypothesis, puts here another or a new sense on the word *God*: for he saw it was inconsistent with his Opinion; that in this Clause *God* should be interpreted, as it was in the foregoing. Indeed it would be strange Non-sense; for then *the Word was God* should signify, the second Person of the Trinity was with the Three Persons of the Trinity. Therefore in his Hypothesis, *the Word was God*, signifies, *the Word was a Divine Person in the Godhead*, *pag.* 216. But this Interpretation is no less absurd than the other; for by *the Word*, he understands a Divine Person who is called *the Word*, and by *God* too he means a Divine Person in the Godhead. Therefore his Interpretation of these Words, *the Word was God*, amounts only to this, the Divine Person, who is called the Word, was a Divine Person.

But to give us a right and full understanding of this place, he thought fit to paraphrase it thus; ‘ *In the Beginning was the* ‘ *Word, and the Word was with God, and the* ‘ *Word was God*; that is, In the Beginning ‘ of all Things was the Divine Person, whose ‘ Name and Character is *the Word*; this ‘ Word was inseparably united to that Su‘ pream Being, whom we call God, and was ‘ himself God, a Divine Person subsisting in ‘ the Unity of the Godhead; not a Power ‘ and Faculty as Reason is in Man. I hope the Author will not take it ill, if I paraphrase his Paraphrase, to make it clearer to vulgar Understandings. ‘ In the Begin‘ ning of all Things, was the second Divine ‘ Person of the Trinity, whose Name and ‘ Character is the Word; this second Di‘ vine Person of the Trinity was inseparably ‘ united with the Three Persons of the Tri‘ nity, whom we call God, and consequent‘ ly with himself; and this second Person ‘ was a Divine Person, not a Power and ‘ Faculty, as Reason is in Man. Our Author was so taken with this sense of the Words of St. *John*, that he could not forbear breaking out into these Words, *Can any thing be more easy and obvious, and more agreeable to the Doctrine of the Trinity?* I confess, 'tis very agreeable to the Doctrine of the Trinity.

2. Thô I have shown already the inconsistency of the Trinitarian Hypothesis, with

the First Chapter of St. *John's Gospel*, by confuting the Author's Explication; yet I intend to make it appear farther, by these few Considerations: (1.) That *to be in the Beginning*, cannot here signify, to be from all Eternity, has been proved already; because the Scripture does never describe Eternity by such an Expression, nor does the Expression *in its own Nature* denote Eternity: St. *John* would not have expressed so great a Mystery, and so necessary to be believed by All, in improper and unsuitable Words. (2.) For the Word to be with God, and to be God, can never bear the sense which the *Trinitarians* put upon it. When *John* says, *the Word was with God*; if by *God* we must understand the Three Persons of the Trinity, and by *the Word* a Divine Person in that Trinity; this Interpretation makes, as I have shewed, this absurd sense; 'The second Divine Person 'of the Trinity was with the Three Persons 'of the Trinity, and consequently with 'himself. But if by *God* we must understand *the Father* only; why does St. *John* omit the Holy Ghost, who is God as well as the Father, and with whom the Son was no less than with the Father? In a word (as the Historian speaks) How comes the Father to ingross here the Title of *God*, to the exclusion of the Holy Ghost? (3.) *The Word was God*, must signify in this Hypothesis; 'That Divine Person who is called the 'Word, was a Divine Person. (4.) All *Trinitarians* confess, that St. *John* in the Beginning of his *Gospel*, speaks of the New Creation wrought by the Gospel, as well as of the Old; and thô they do not agree among themselves about the place, where he begins to treat of this New Creation or Regeneration; yet they do all grant, that he discourses of it before, Ver. 14. *And the Word was made Flesh*. They all take those words, *He came unto his own*, Ver. 11. to be meant of Christ's conversing among Men, and teaching them the way of Salvation. But if *the Word was made Flesh*, at Ver. 14. signifies Christ's Incarnation, as *Trinitarians* pretend, it is unaccountable that St. *John*, writing the History of Christ's Life, should first tell us *what Christ Incarnate has done*, and then that *He was Incarnate*. This is just as if one, writing the Life of *Alexander*, should say, he overcame *Darius*; and then, that he was begotten by *Philip* King of *Macedon*. Or, that Christ was tempted of the Devil; and then, that he was conceived by the Holy Ghost. Indeed it cannot be denied, that the Evangelists do not very much observe the order of time, in relating several Discourses and Miracles of Christ; but this is of no great moment, and does not destroy *the proper and essential order of History*. The former has been done by the Evangelists, as well as by other Historians; but never the latter. They never tell us, that Christ went about to preach the Gospel; and then, that he was born: or that, he was raised from the dead; and then, that he died. This would be to invert the true order of History, and make Non-sense of it: And therefore it sufficiently proves that these words, *The Word was made Flesh*, coming after *He came unto his own*, cannot be meant of Christ's Incarnation. Thus Ver. 6, 7. *John* is said to bear witness of Christ, and then that he was Incarnate. The like we may observe on Ver. 10. *He was in the World, and the World was made by him*; if those Words, *The World was made by him*, are to be understood in a proper sense of Creation, the Apostle should have said first, that the World *was made by him*, and then that *He was in the World*. (5.) This Evangelist plainly tells us (Chap. 20. Ver. 21.) the design he aimed at when he wrote his Gospel; *These Things are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have Life thro his Name*. It was not therefore to teach the Divinity and Consubstantiality of Christ, as *Trinitarians* pretend. He wrote, that we might be sure that Jesus is the Christ, *the Son of God*, not that he was God. How comes he then to forget the most essential Thing, which induced him to write and publish

liſh his Goſpel, *viz.* the aſſerting of Chriſt's Divinity? No, no, it is plain, he only deſigned to teach and prove, that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God. And the Son of God can no more be God, than a Son can be his Father. Thus I think it appears clearly, that this Beginning of St. *John*'s *Goſpel* does not favour the Trinitarian Opinion; but from Ver. 1, to Ver. 15. is only an Abridgment of his whole Book. Were the Trinitarian Hypotheſis clearly ſet down in other places of Scripture, I would not wonder to ſee Men lay ſo much ſtreſs upon this place: but ſince the Scriptures throughout teach us, that Chriſt was but a Man; it ſtands to reaſon, that we ſhould explain one obſcure place by a thouſand that are plain and eaſy.

3. I come now to aſſign the true Senſe of this famous Context.

Verſ. 1, 2. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God: The ſame was in the beginning with God.*

PARAPHRASE.

'When Jeſus, who is called the Word, 'becauſe he was the Meſſenger and Preacher 'of God's Will and Word, and (as it were) 'the Mouth by which God pronounced his 'Oracles, *began* to preach the Goſpel; he 'was *intimate to the moſt ſecret Counſels of God*, 'like one who is in the very Boſom of his Father; and he was *in the form of God*, and 'like God, by reaſon of the Glory and Majeſty that did ſhine in him.

1. That the *Man* Jeſus may be called *the Word*, or the Word of God, no Body will deny who reads *Rev.* 19. 13. where Jeſus is thus deſcribed; *He was clothed with a Veſture dipt in Blood, and his Name is called The Word of God.* He who is here called *the Word of God*, who is clothed with a Veſture *dipt in Blood*, muſt be *the Man* Jeſus. Our Lord calls himſelf *the Way*, becauſe he teaches us the way to Salvation; and *the Light*, in this very Chapter, becauſe he is the bringer of it: therefore why not alſo *the Word of God*, becauſe he was the Revealer, Bringer, and firſt Preacher of it?

2. It appears by the ſecond Verſe, that the Evangeliſt did not deſign to make a real Diſtinction, between *to be in the beginning*, and *to be with God*; for what was diſtinctly ſpoken in the firſt Verſe, is put together in the ſecond, thus, *The ſame was in the beginning with God.* In effect, the meaning of the Apoſtle is not, that Chriſt was, when he began to enter upon his Prophetick Office; this would be no great wonder: but that, when he began to preach the Doctrine of the Goſpel, he was admitted into the moſt intimate Counſels of God, or made partaker of his moſt ſecret Will. This I think to be the reaſon of the Repetition contained in the ſecond Verſe; beſides that we may obſerve, that Repetitions are very frequent throughout the whole Goſpel of St. *John*, and more uſed in that Book than in any other of the New Teſtament. Thus when the ſame Apoſtle ſays, 1 John 1. 1. *That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, &c.* he does not pretend really to diſtinguiſh thoſe two things, and to ſay that the Goſpel was in the beginning of the Goſpel; but that what he had ſeen and heard of the Goſpel from the beginning of it, that he declared unto Men.

3. I have proved before, that *In the beginning* cannot ſignify the beginning of the World: but that it is here uſed for the beginning of the Goſpel, the place laſt quoted (and ſeveral others) do ſufficiently prove.

4. *To be with God*, and *to be in the Boſom of the Father* (at ver. 18.) are equivalent Terms. If therefore we know the true Senſe of the latter Expreſſion, we ſhall have a right underſtanding of the former. The Words at *ver.* 18. run thus; *No Man hath ſeen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the Boſom of the Father, he has declared him.* Now to ſee God in St. *John*'s Stile, is to know the Decrees and Will of God concerning the Diſpenſation of the Goſpel. Thoſe words therefore ought to be thus paraphraſed; 'No Man knew at

'any time the Will and Decrees of God, 'concerning the Diſpenſation of the Goſpel: 'the beloved Son of God, who was admitted 'into his moſt ſecret Counſels, has fully diſ-'covered them to us. The Word *Only-begotten*, is put here for *Beloved*, by way of Excellence; and ſo it is uſed very often, both in Profane and Sacred Authors. And to be *in the Boſom of the Father*, is not here an Interpretation of *Only-begotten* (that is, Beſt-Beloved) but it is brought in as the reaſon of the full knowledg that Chriſt had of God's Will, and of the diſcovery he made of it. Chriſt, ſaith our Evangeliſt here, has fully declared the Will and Counſels of God to us. How ſo? Becauſe he was intimate and admitted to the moſt ſecret and hidden Counſels of God; which he expreſſes by the Son's being *in the Boſom* of the Father. This is then the true Senſe of this Phraſe, *The Word was with God, viz.* God diſcovered to him the whole extent of his Will, he kept nothing ſecret from him, he filled him up with the Treaſures of Wiſdom and Knowledg.

5. We may eaſily underſtand the true meaning of *the Word was God*, if we compare them with *Phil.* 2. 6. where Chriſt is ſaid to be *in the form of God*, and *equal with God*, or rather *like God*, as ἴσα θεῷ ought to be rendred. Chriſt was in the form of God, and like God; by reaſon of the Power and Authority beſtowed upon him, whereby he wrought all ſorts of Miracles; raiſing the Dead, curing the Lame, reſtoring ſight to the Blind, ſtilling the Winds and the Sea, *&c.* This we may apply to the words of St. *John*. Jeſus was not only in the Boſom of God, Partaker of his moſt ſecret Counſels; but he was beſides inveſted with ſuch Authority and Power, as made him like God. So that Chriſt is by St. *John* called *God* (or rather, *a* God) by reaſon of that Power and Authority, whereby he became in ſome manner like unto the true and moſt High God. But this Appellation does no more prove him to be the *true and moſt High God*, than *Solomon*, or the Judges, in the *Pſalms*, will be *the True God*, becauſe this Name *God* is given to them, *Pſal.* 82. 6. and 45. 6.

Ver. 3. *All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made, that was made.*

PARAPHRASE.

'All things, neceſſary to the Propagati-'on of the Goſpel, were *performed* by him, 'the Author and firſt Preacher of it. And 'without his Direction, there was not any 'thing *performed* that was *performed*. That this relates not to the Creation of the World, but to the Diſpenſation of the Goſpel, is very plain from the following words, *In him was Life, and the Life was the Light of Men*, &c. In theſe words the Evangeliſt teaches us, how all things were *made* by Chriſt, becauſe in him was the Life and Light of Men; which all Men may diſcern, to be ſpoken of the Goſpel by him taught; which is the Light of Men and their Life, as it leads them to Eternal Life.

Ver. 10, 11. *He was in the World, and the World was made by him, and the World knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not.*

PARAPHRASE.

'He was converſing *among Men*, to teach 'them the way to Salvation; ſome of them 'were *reclaimed* by him, but *the greater part* 'rejected him. He was ſent to his own Bre-'thren, but moſt of them would not re-'ceive him. It does ſufficiently appear by theſe words, *and the World knew him not*, that the Apoſtle ſpeaks only of Men, who only are capable of knowing; not of this viſible World: As indeed the 11*th* Verſe is a plain Explication of Verſe 10. St. *John* expreſſes in this Chapter the ſame thing ſeveral ways: *He was in the World*; *He came unto his own*; *The Light ſhined in Darkneſs*; theſe are equivalent Expreſſions. So alſo, *The World knew him not*; *His own received him not*; *the Darkneſs comprehended it not*; ſig-nify

nify one and the ſame thing. Thus, *the World was made by him*, is explained at Ver. 12. thus, *But as many as received him, to them gave he Power to become the Sons of God*; and by Verſe 4, and 9. So that in all this, there was no Intention to ſay that the Old Creation was the work of Jeſus Chriſt.

CHAP. VIII.

HIS ſecond Charge is, That Socinianiſm makes the Jewiſh Oeconomy very unreaſonable and unaccountable, *pag.* 231. becauſe if Chriſt were no more than a meer Man, the Anti-type ſhould fall very ſhort of the Types contained in the Old Teſtament. 'The Tabernacle and Temple, 'ſays he, was God's Houſe where he choſe 'to dwell by the viſible Symbols of his 'Preſence; and was ſo contrived, as to be 'the Figure both of Heaven and Earth; for 'ſo the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* expreſly tells 'us, the Holy of Holies was a Figure of 'Heaven. —— But we muſt all confeſs, 'that this was a very unaccountable and in'ſignificant Ceremony, for God, who fills 'Heaven and Earth with his Preſence, to 'dwell in an Houſe made with Hands, — had 'it not prefigured ſomething more Divine 'and Myſterious. —— The Temple then 'was a Figure, and we muſt inquire, what 'it was the Figure of? Now a Typical Pre'ſence can be a Figure of nothing but a real 'Preſence, and God's Perſonal dwelling a'mong Men: for Preſence and Habitation 'can ſignify nothing but Preſence, and a 'Figure muſt be a Figure of ſome thing 'that is real; and nothing can anſwer to a 'figurative viſible Preſence of God, but a 'perſonal viſible Preſence. He goes on, and applies this to Chriſt, who (at *John* 2. 19.) calls his Body a Temple; which (ſays our Author) was that in Truth and Reality, which the Temple was but a Figure of, that is, *God's Preſence on Earth*, which he explains of his being perſonally united to Chriſt's Humane Nature. 'But if Chriſt 'be not Incarnate, adds he, if the Divine 'Word be not perſonally united to the 'Humane Nature; the Body of Chriſt is 'but a figurative Temple, as the Temple 'at *Jeruſalem* was: and then one Figure is 'made a Type of another; which is as 'great an Abſurdity in Types, as a Metaphor 'of a Metaphor in ſpeech. I do not remember I ever ſaw ſo much trifling, ſo ſeriouſly urged in a weighty Queſtion: but I have undertaken the drudgery of making Reflections on it; and therefore will conſider what he has offered. ——

1. That the Temple was a Figure both of Heaven and Earth, I am content to admit; the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* may be interpreted to that purpoſe. But that it was alſo a Type of Chriſt's Body, we have no colour from Scripture to affirm it; and the Author has offer'd no other ground for it, but his own wandring Fancy.

The Author to the *Hebrews*, who inlarges upon the Temple, does not give the leaſt Intimation of this: why then ſhould we contrive Types and Figures of our own, without any reaſon for it? If this be allowed, we may make Types of any thing; and increaſe Figures to an infinite Number. If the Author is in love with cold and groundleſs Allegories, every Body is not of his Mind, and therefore he ſhould keep them to himſelf. But why ſhould the Temple be a Figure of Chriſt's Body, rather than the Ark? God is ſaid, all over the Old Teſtament, to dwell between the Cherubims; it was the proper Seat of God, where he gave forth his Oracles, and made his *Glory* to appear by

by affording ſenſible Signs of his Preſence. If therefore ſuch Allegories had any Signification of future Times and Things, it would be more probable that the Ark was a Type of Chriſt's Body, than the Temple: the rather, becauſe we know already by a Divine Teſtimony, that the Temple was a Figure of ſome-thing elſe. But he will ſay, that Chriſt calls his Body a Temple. What then? ſo St. *Paul* calls the Corinthians; *Ye are*, ſays he, *the Temple of God*. Was the Temple at *Jeruſalem* a Figure or Type of the Bodies of the Corinthians? Or does our Saviour ſay, that he calls his Body a Temple, becauſe it was the Anti-type of the Temple of the Jews?

2. Thô the Temple were not a Figure of Chriſt's Body, yet it would be no unaccountable and inſignificant Ceremony, for God to dwell in an Houſe made with Hands; to appoint this the place of his Worſhip, *&c.* which our Author thinks to be inexplicable without admitting his Doctrine of the Trinity. Who knows not, that the *Iſraelites* were given to Idolatry; and that the pompous way of Worſhip uſed among the neighbouring Nations, agreed ſo much to their Fancies, that it was neceſſary to comply with them in this thing, that they might be kept from worſhipping other Gods, and the current of Idolatry be reſtrained. Thus God in his infinite Wiſdom thought fit to ſet up among his People a carnal and ſenſible Worſhip; and to appoint an Houſe where he would dwell after a particular Manner, and afford viſible Symbols of his Preſence. All this he did to accommodate himſelf to the groſs genius of the *Iſraelites*, and to perſwade them to forſake Idols, and to acknowledg no other God but himſelf. This was the true reaſon of the Temple, of God's dwelling there, and the Glory with which it was ſometimes filled: and to affirm that all was done, to prefigure Chriſt's Body, is a Fancy which the Author might better have kept to himſelf.

3. But ſuppoſe the Temple was a Type of Chriſt's Body; yet there is no need God ſhould be incarnate in Chriſt's Body, to anſwer that Type. The Scriptures tell us, God was *with* Chriſt, and *in* Chriſt; which I hope might be done without an Incarnation or Perſonal Union, as he was in the Temple. As God ſpake in the Temple, ſo he ſpake *in* and *by* Chriſt. But beſides all this, Chriſt was *greater than the Temple*; becauſe God was *always* preſent with him, which cannot be ſaid of the Temple, where the Signs of God's Preſence were not always viſible. God's Dwelling in Chriſt was always conſpicuous by the Oracles which he delivered, and the Miracles he wrought.

But he objects a place of Scripture. 'To 'this, ſays he, St. *John* plainly alludes; '*The Word was made Fleſh, and dwelt amongſt* '*us, and we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of* '*the only-begotten of the Father, full of Grace* '*and Truth.* Ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, *tabernacled a*-'mongſt us; fulfilled that Type of God's 'dwelling in the Tabernacle and Temple at '*Jeruſalem*, by his dwelling Perſonally in 'Humane Nature.

This Argument, or rather Congruity, is grounded on two falſe Suppoſitions. The firſt is, that *The Word was made Fleſh*, is meant of Chriſt's Incarnation. The ſecond, that in theſe Words, ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, which we render *he dwelt amongſt us*; St. *John* alludes to God's dwelling in the Tabernacle. I begin with the firſt. It cannot be denied that ἐγένετο may be rendred *was*, as well as *was made*. Thus it is taken, *Luke* 1. 5. and 24. 19. and even at Verſe 6. of this Chapter. Nor can it be doubted that the word *Fleſh* ſignifies not only *Humane Nature*; but very often Humane Nature *as ſubject to Infirmities and Afflictions*. Now is it not more agreeable to Reaſon and Scripture, to interpret theſe words thus; 'And the Word (Jeſus) *was* a Man like 'unto us in all things, Sin excepted; having 'the ſame Mortal Nature, being expoſed to 'the ſame Miſeries and Afflictions: than to ſay, *The Word was Incarnate*, which is a Language unknown to Scripture; wherein we never find, that God made himſelf Man; and

and altogether repugnant to Reaſon? And this I confirm by *Heb.* 2. 14. *Foraſmuch then as the Children are Partakers of Fleſh and Blood; He likewiſe himſelf took part of the ſame, that thrô Death he might deſtroy him that had the Power of Death, even the Devil.* Here Chriſt is ſaid to be Partaker of Fleſh and Blood, as pious Men are; which cannot be meant in a ſenſe of Incarnation, for pious Men are not ſaid to be Incarnate: but the one and the other are Partakers of Fleſh and Blood, that is, of Infirmities and Sufferings. This he explains farther at Verſe 17. *Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his Brethren:* but his Brethren were not Incarnate. But at Ver. 10, and 18. he expreſly expounds this of Chriſt's Sufferings: Ver. 10. *It became him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, to make the Captain of their Salvation, perfect through Sufferings.* Ver. 18. *For in that he himſelf hath ſuffered, — he is able to ſuccour them that are tempted.* Mr. *Limborch* ſaw and confeſſed this that I have been ſaying; his Words are theſe, *Theol. Chriſt. pag.* 226. 'The true ſenſe of this place, is, that *the Word was Fleſh:* That is, a true fleſhly Subſtance, 'ſubject to all the Infirmities that attend our 'Fleſh; that is to ſay, He was Mortal, Vile 'and Contemptible. Which appeared more 'eſpecially in the days of his Paſſion and of 'his Death, which are called at *Heb.* 5. 7. '*The days of his Fleſh.*

2. Our Author, charmed with Allegories and myſterious Interpretations, has found out, that St. *John* alludes here to God's dwelling in the Tabernacle; and this he thinks God did, to make the Anti-type anſwer the Type, Chriſt's Body to the Tabernacle or Temple. Since he is ſo much in love with Allegories, it may be I may do him a kindneſs to help him to one, which I have ready at hand; it is this: As the Tabernacle in the Wilderneſs had no fixed place to ſtand in, as the Temple afterwards had, but was carried from one place to another; according to the ſeveral Incampments of the *Iſraelites:* So Chriſt, to fulfil that Type, was always wandring with his Diſciples, having *no where to lay his Head*, Mat. 8. 20. This Allegory is as probable, and more natural than his; without ſuppoſing an impoſſible Incarnation. I cannot tell, whether the Author will like it better than his own; I am ſure, I like neither of them. No, no, there is no Myſtery in the Greek Word: Our *Verſion* renders it well, *He dwelt among us:* So does *Seb. Caſtalio, Et apud nos, Gratiæ Veritatiſq; plenus, habitavit; And he full of Grace and Truth dwelt among us.* And the ſame word is thus uſed without any Myſtery, *Rev.* 12. 12. and 13. 6. where it is applied to the Inhabitants of Heaven. By way of concluſion, I will ſet down the ſenſe of the whole Verſe, which is an Abridgment of the Life of Chriſt: 'The *Word was Fleſh*, a mortal Man, ob'noxious to Sufferings and Death: here is 'his Prieſtly Office. *He dwelt among us full* 'of *Grace and Truth*; here is his Prophetic 'Office. *We have ſeen his Glory*; here is his 'Kingly Office. Thus therefore we ought to paraphraſe the whole; 'Jeſus Chriſt was 'a Mortal Man, Partaker of Fleſh and Blood, 'ſubject to the ſame Infirmities that we are; 'in a word, like unto us in all things, but Sin. 'And he dwelt among us, preaching the happy News of Reconciliation with God, and 'the Doctrine and Truth revealed to him by 'the Father. But thô he were a Mortal 'Man, a Man of Sufferings and Griefs; yet 'we have ſeen his Glory, ſhining in his Mi'racles, his Tranſfiguration, his Reſurrecti'on, his Aſcenſion into Heaven, *&c.* Such a 'Glory as was well becoming *the beloved* Son 'of God.

Having ſpoken of the Temple, he comes to diſcourſe of Sacrifices, and tells us; 'The 'true meaning of *the Lamb ſlain from the Foun'dation of the World*, is not meerly that he was 'ſlain *in God's Decree*; for what God has de'creed to be done, is not therefore ſaid to be 'done, before it is done. But this Lamb was 'ſlain in Types and Figures, from the Foun'dation of the World; ever ſince the fall of '*Adam*, in thoſe early Sacrifices which were 'offered after the Fall, which were Typical 'of the Sacrifice of Chriſt. But, 1. Where has

has he found, that those early Sacrifices were Typical of the Sacrifice of Christ? The Scripture is silent about it; and the Apostle to the *Hebrews*, who inlarges on the Sacrifices of the *Mosaical Law*, does not so much as mention those that were offer'd before; which is unaccountable, if they were Figures of the Sacrifice of Christ. 2. But he says; 'He 'knows no Principle of natural Reason, that 'teaches us to offer the Blood of Beasts to 'God; and therefore he must think, the 'Sacrifices of Beasts to be an Institution. But suppose those early Sacrifices were an Institution, does it follow from thence, that they were instituted to be Types of the Sacrifice of Christ? By no means: God might have other Reasons for such an Appointment. But since the Scripture does not mention the appointing of those Sacrifices; we have good reason to believe, that they were of Humane Institution: for had God appointed them, it would not (it should seem) have been omitted in Scripture. 'Tis reasonable to think, that *Abel* and *Cain* thought fit to offer Sacrifices and Oblations to God; to shew by such visible Marks, the Sense they had of God's Majesty; and to express the Reverence they ought to pay to him. 3. To deny, that the Lamb was slain from the Foundation of the World meerly in God's Decree, *because what God has decreed to be done, is not therefore said to be done before it is done*, is no very accurate reasoning in a Divine; because 'tis contrary to the stile of Scripture. Is there any thing more usual with the sacred Writers, especially with the Prophets, than to speak of things to come, as if they were come to pass already, by reason of their certainty and the immutable Decree of God? And why then cannot the Lamb be said to be slain from the beginning of the World, meerly because God had certainly decreed it should be so? 4. But if he is not satisfied with this Explication, here is another for him. There is a *Transposition* in the words of this Verse, which also may be observed in many other Texts of Scripture; so that the Verse may be read thus, *Whose Names are not written from the Foundation of the World, in the Book of Life, of the Lamb slain.* This reading is confirmed by Chap. 17. Ver. 8. *Whose Names are not written in the Book of Life, from the Foundation of the World.* So the sense of the controverted Text, is; 'The Names of those who worship the 'Dragon were never written in the Book of 'Life of the slain Lamb; that is, in the Book 'of the Martyrs and Confessors of Christ, who 'were destined to eternal Life from the 'Foundations of the World.

Pag. 237. 'He desires some of the learned Reasoning *Socinians*, honestly to tell 'him; what account they can give of the 'Jewish Priesthood and Sacrifices, which is '*becoming God.* Why should God be propitiated by a Man, subject to the same Sins 'and Infirmities, and very often guilty of 'them, that other Men are? Why innocent 'Beasts must die, to expiate the Sins of 'Men? The thing he aims at, is to prove that the *Socinian* Doctrine ridicules the *Jewish* Oeconomy. How so? The *Jews* Sacrifices, says he, were Typical of Christ's Sacrifice. We grant it; for so the Apostle to the *Hebrews* intimates: we say only, that this was not the chief and primary end for which they were instituted. But what then? The Death of Christ was therefore a Sacrifice. So it was. Then he was not a Metaphorical Priest. No more he was. Then he was the Divine Word Incarnate. How so? This he should prove, but he takes it for granted. I want the Author's Spectacles, how to draw this Consequence, *therefore the Socinian Doctrine ridicules the Jewish Oeconomy*, from that Argument. Now to this Question, concerning the Jewish Priesthood and Sacrifices, I answer with St. *Paul*, Gal. 3. 19. *The Law* (the Ceremonial Law, the Law of Sacrifices and other external Rites) *was added because of Transgressions*: i.e. by reason of the Idolatry of the *Israelites*, which could not be restrained but by such a Method. Had not the *Jews* been inclined so much to Idolatry, by seeing the Worship of their Neighbours round them; God would not have put on their Necks this *Yoke, which* (as St. *Peter* says) *they were not able to bear.*

God

God himſelf ſays this, Jer. 7. 22. *I ſpake not unto your Fathers nor commanded them, in the day that I brought them out of the Land of* Egypt, *concerning Burnt-Offerings or Sacrifices: But this thing commanded I them, ſaying, Obey my Voice, and I will be your God, and ye ſhall be my People.* Here we may plainly ſee, that God at firſt required nothing from his People, but to own him, and obey his reaſonable Laws, the Moral and Political Laws he deſigned for them: but he was, as it were, conſtrained to inſtitute Sacrifices, and other external and pompous Rites, by their Idolatrous Inclination. I refer our Author, about this matter, to Learned Dr. *Spencer*, the beſt Writer on the Ceremonial Law. This then is the true and primary Reaſon of God's appointing Sacrifices; and very well *becoming both* his Wiſdom and Goodneſs. And it hinders not, but thoſe Sacrifices might be alſo Typical of the Sacrifice of Chriſt: they were ſo, ſecondarily. God who appointed Sacrifices to ſtop the progreſs of Idolatry, did alſo by them prefigure the Sacrifice of Chriſt. *But a mere Man*, ſays he, *can be no more than a Metaphorical and Typical Prieſt and Sacrifice.* This, I think, deſerved to be proved. A Metaphorical or Typical Prieſt and Sacrifice are here oppoſed to a true Prieſt and Sacrifice; yet he tells us, that *tho the Prieſts and Sacrifices of the Law were Typical, they were true and proper Prieſts and Sacrifices; and made a true and proper expiation for Sin, as far as they reached.* But if the Prieſts of the Law were true and proper Prieſts, and the Sacrifices true and proper Sacrifices; much more will the Sacrifice of Chriſt be a true and proper Sacrifice, tho he alſo was a Man. This Conſequence the Author himſelf has afforded us. Now becauſe the Anti-Type, as he ſays, ought to be greater than the Type; what remains, is only to inquire, Whether Chriſt be a more excellent Prieſt and Sacrifice, than the Prieſts and Sacrifices of the Law? The Prieſts of the Law were but ordinary Men, diſtinguiſhed from others only by the Dignity of their Prieſthood: but Chriſt was the *Meſſias*, the Son of God, intruſted with his ſecret Will, indued with an immenſe Authority and Power, and made (as it were) God by the unſpeakable Gifts of God his Father. The Prieſts of the Law were called to their Prieſt-hood in an ordinary way; but Chriſt by God's immediate appointment. The High-Prieſts of the Law entred only into a Tabernacle made with Hands, and but once a Year into the *moſt Holy* Place; but Chriſt into a Tabernacle whoſe Builder and Maker is God, and is to continue there for ever. Surely therefore, tho he is a Man only, this Anti-Type is more excellent than the Types, and Chriſt a more excellent High-Prieſt and Sacrifice than thoſe of the Law. So that here is no ridiculing the Jewiſh Oeconomy, by the *Socinian* Hypotheſis: but our Author by ſuch ungrounded Charges, and weak Proofs, has written a Book very fit to confirm *Socinians* in their Opinions.

CHAP. IX.

III. HIS Third Charge is, *Socinianiſm* ridicules the Chriſtian Religion, makes it a very mean and contemptible Inſtitution.

He tells us, That 'The Fundamental *My-*'*ſtery* of the Chriſtian Religion is the ſtupen-'dious Love of God in giving his own Son, 'his only-beloved Son, for the Redemption 'of Mankind. But how comes this Love of God to be called a Myſtery ſtill? It was a Myſtery, or *Secret*, before the Revelation of the Goſpel; but ſince it was revealed, it ceaſes to be a Myſtery or Secret: unleſs a Secret diſcovered be a Secret ſtill.

'This, ſays he, our Saviour lays great 'ſtreſs on; That *God ſo loved the World, that 'he gave his only begotten Son, that whoſoever 'believeth in him ſhould not periſh, but have ever-'laſting Life.* By this, one would have 'thought, that Chriſt had been the Son, the 'only begotten Son of God, before God gave 'him. Now this is a very ambiguous way of expreſſing himſelf; for he profeſſes to believe that Chriſt was the Son of God, nay *the only begotten Son, before* he gave him; but he differs from Us and from Common Senſe in this; that by *the Son of God*, he means God himſelf; and by *before*, he means from all Eternity. This is a very hard Language; for who can fancy, that *the Son of God* ſhould be *God himſelf*; and that *before*, ſhould ſignify Eternity? Yet this is the Senſe he puts upon it, when he ſays; 'If *Socinianiſm* be true, 'God did not give any Son he had *before*; but 'made an excellent Man, whom he was 'pleaſed to call his only begotten Son. When our Saviour ſays, *God ſo loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son; &c.* I deſire our Author to tell me, what is meant by the Word *God*, Whether the whole Trinity, or the Father only? If the whole Trinity, the Senſe will come to this; The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt ſo loved the World, that they gave their only begotten Son. Which is falſe; for in the *Trinitarian* Hypotheſis, the Son is not the Son of the Second or Third Perſons in the Trinity. If by God be meant the Father only; How comes the Father to ingroſs here the Title of God, to the Excluſion of the Son and the Holy Ghoſt? How is he only ſaid, to *love the World*; for the Son and Holy Ghoſt love it as well as the Father? Thus they are not the *Socinians*, but the *Trinitarians* that ridicule the Chriſtian Religion, by putting on it an abſurd and unnatural Senſe.

'But, ſays he, God's Love in giving his 'only-begotten Son for our Redemption, 'which our Saviour fixes on as the great De-'monſtration of God's Love, is not ſo won-'derful; if this giving his Son ſignifies no 'more, than making a Man on purpoſe to be 'our Saviour. What then? Does it follow from thence, that the *Socinian* Doctrine ridicules the Chriſtian Religion? It only follows, that the *Socinian* Doctrine makes the Love of God leſs wonderful than the *Trinitarian*. For in it ſelf it is a wonderful Love, that God ſhould raiſe up a Saviour, to Apoſtate and Rebel Mankind; tho this Saviour was not God himſelf. But why ſhould we call a Chimera a more wonderful Love; for the Son of God cannot be God himſelf, and therefore God could not ſhew his Love by giving ſuch a Son. To conclude; as the Love of God in redeeming Offenders, is wonderful, be the means what they will: So his Love in giving for them his Beloved Son, tho but a Man, cannot without Impiety be denied, to be wonderful to a Miracle. The ridiculing is only on the ſide of our Author, not on the *Unitarian*; and I am apt to think, that if I were not an *Unitarian* already, his Book (made up of bold Charges, inconſequent Reaſonings, and arrogant Definings of what he underſtands not) would make me one.

'In the next place, ſays he, at *pag.* 239. 'the Apoſtles mightily inſiſt on the great 'Love of Chriſt in dying for us, and his great 'Humility in ſubmitting to the condition of 'Human Nature, and ſuffering a ſhameful 'and accurſed Death, even the Death of the 'Croſs. He cites 2 *Cor.* 8. 9. and 5. 14. and *Phil.* 2. 5, 6, 7, 8. And goes on thus; 'Suppoſing Chriſt to be but a meer Man, who 'had no being before he was born of the Vir-'gin; who knew nothing of his own coming 'into the World, or for what end he came; 'whoſe Undertaking was not his own volun-'tary choice, but God's appointment; Where 'is the great Love, where is the great Humi-'lity of this? The meaning of all this is, that were not Chriſt the Supream God, whatever he has done on our behalf, would be no great Argument of his Love, or his Humility. If *Codrus* and *Decius* devoting themſelves to Death, for the Good of their reſpective Countries, have been accounted by all Men, great Lovers of their Countries; Shall not Chriſt's dying for the Eternal Salvation

of Mankind, paſs for an Argument of wonderful Love? Is it nothing for Chriſt to lead a wandring poor and miſerable Life, to expoſe himſelf to all the Injuries and Fury of Implacable Adverſaries, to undergo a painful and infamous Death; and all this to make Men partakers of everlaſting Life: Muſt all this be accounted nothing, unleſs the Perſon ſo doing be the Supream God? *How did he become Poor*, ſays he, *who was never Rich?* But I ask him, How the Supream God can *become Poor*; How God can *make himſelf of no Reputation*, or *humble himſelf and become obedient unto Death*; all which things he imputeth to a Perſon who is God? I would know, How it comes that Chriſt's Love and Humility is deſcribed by ſuch Characters, as can only be applied to a Man; if we muſt not be allowed to believe, that the Love of *Chriſt-Man* was wonderful? He inſiſts much on 2 *Cor.* 8. 9. where our Tranſlation ſays, Chriſt *became Poor*. But he might know, that the Greek πτωχευσεν does not ſignify *to become Poor*, but *to be Poor*; and ſo *Caſtalio* renders it. So the Senſe of that place is this; 'Tho Chriſt 'was Rich and Glorious, by reaſon of the 'Authority and Power conferred on him: 'yet he was willing to lead a poor Life, that 'by his Poverty (as by one means) we 'might obtain Eternal Riches and Glory.

The Hiſtorian explains *being in the Form of God* at *Phil.* 1. 6. by *being made Like to God*, by a Communication to him of Divine and Miraculous Power over Diſeaſes, Devils, the Grave, the Winds, the Seas, *&c.* To this our Author replies; 'This dwindles *the Form* 'of God into juſt nothing; for according to 'them, he had no power to do this, but 'God did it at his Word, as he did for o-'ther Prophets. And therefore this is no '*Form of God*, no likeneſs at all: For Chriſt 'did not work Miracles as God does, by an 'inherent Power; but God wrought Mira-'cles for him. Chriſt indeed could not work Miracles by an inherent or proper Power of his own, ſince he was not God; but to conclude that therefore there was no form or likeneſs of God at all in him, is a very bad Conſequence. When we ſay, that Chriſt was in the form or likeneſs of God; we exclude thereby an equality with God, and we mean only, that he was in a manner like God. This may be explained by a Compariſon. It may be ſaid, that a Vice-Roy is like a King; but this does not ſignify, that he is the King himſelf, or is equal to the King; but only, that by reaſon of the Power and Authority conferred on him, he is in a manner like the King: So that thō he does not act by a Power of his own, yet he may be truly ſaid to act like a King. To conclude from hence, that this dwindles the likeneſs of the Vice-Roy with the King, into juſt nothing, would be meer Impertinence: for then a Porter would be as like a King as the Vice-Roy himſelf; which no Man in his Senſes will affirm. When therefore Chriſt, by the Power beſtowed upon him, caſt out Devils, cured all ſorts of Diſeaſes, raiſed the Dead, commanded the Winds and the Seas; He was indeed in the likeneſs of God, and it was a great Humility in him, that he was ſo far from making an Oſtentation of his Glory and Greatneſs, that he became like a Servant, humbled himſelf, and underwent all ſorts of Sufferings, even the Death of the Croſs.

'But, ſays the Author, *pag.* 241. How did 'he *take this Form* upon him, which figni-'fies his own free and voluntary Choice; 'when he did not take it, but was made 'ſo! What? when the Apoſtle ſays, that Chriſt *took upon him the Form of a Servant*; muſt we ſay, that he did not? Is it not a plain Contradiction to the Apoſtle? He adds; 'And what Humility was this, for a meer 'Man to be a Miniſter and Servant of God; 'and ſo great a Miniſter as to be in the Form 'of God, that is (as he ſays) to be glorious 'for Miracles, and admired as the great 'Power of God: eſpecially, when he was 'to be exalted unto Heaven for it, and ad-'vanced above all Principalities and Powers? 'This is ſuch Humility, as would have been '*Pride and Ambition* in the moſt glorious An-'gel. Shall we not call Humility what St. *Paul* calls ſo? He tells us, that the ſame who

has been advanced above all the Orders of Angels, humbled himself. All the Glory that Christ has been crowned with, doth not hinder the Apostle from praising and extolling his Humility. Because Christ's Sufferings have been remunerated with a transcendent Glory; must they not be accounted Humility, but *Pride?* On the contrary, the more that he who humbles himself is great and glorious, the greater is his Humility. Seeing therefore Christ had received from God more Glory than ever any Man had, it follows, that his Humility was the most stupendious and unparallel'd that ever was. But according to our Author's way of reasoning, there is no such thing as Christian Humility. For every Christian who humbles himself, endeavours thereby to fit himself for the Kingdom of Heaven: but all our best Actions are not worthy to be compared with that *Glory which shall be revealed* in us; and therefore will our Author say, Humility is but a Chimera, because he who is said to humble himself, expects to get by the means an Eternal Glory. Indeed if the most bitter Sufferings of Christ, are not to be accounted Humility, because they were to be rewarded with a more excellent Glory: I cannot see, how any Christians may be said to be humble; for they expect a glorious and transcendent Reward.

Pag. 240. 'After Christ was come into 'the World, there was no place (saith our 'Author) for his Choice and Election; he 'could not shew either his Love or his Hu'milicy, in choosing Poverty or Death: 'and therefore if it was matter of his free 'Choice, and a Demonstration of his great 'Humility and Love, as the Apostle says it 'was; he must and did choose it before he 'came into the World. But all this is contrary to the place of the Apostle, wherein he speaks only of what Christ has done since he came into the World, and does not so much as mention what he had done before. Which has forced several Trinitarian Interpreters to acknowledg, that this Text does not relate to the Incarnation. I desire our Author to tell me the meaning of these words, *Who being in the Form of God, thought it not Robbery to be equal with God.* For if to be *in the Form of God*, signifies, *to be the true God*; then the sense will be this; 'Christ being the 'true God, thought it not Robbery to be e'qual with the true God. Which is just as if one should say, *Leopold* who is Emperour does not think it Robbery to be equal with the Emperour. Is it possible, Men should put such a trifling sense on the words of an Apostle? Besides, how can it be said here, that *the Supream God made himself of no Reputation?* In a word, of all the things spoken of Christ in this place, not one of them can be applied to the Supream God: which plainly shews, that the Man Christ Jesus only did humble himself; and that this Humility is so far from proving that Christ is God, that it demonstrates, he was only a Man.

He goes on; 'The Faith and Worship of 'Christ, is the distinguishing Character of 'the Christian Religion. That the Faith of Christ is the distinguishing Character of the Christian Religion, I grant; but I deny, that the Worship of Christ is so too. I suppose, by the Worship of Christ, he means only the Worship of *Christ's Divine Nature*; for he tells us in the following words, that both the Natural and Mosaical Religion *condemn the Worship of any Creature*; therefore Christ's Humane Nature being a Creature, ought not to be worshipped. Of the Worship paid to Christ, I have said enough already; but because our Author gives occasion for it, by repeating his Charge of Idolatry, I will consider what he has offered, in its proper place. Only here I shall mind him; that the Compilers of the Apostles Creed have made no mention of the Worship of Christ, but only of Faith in him.

At *pag.* 245. He goes on to prove, that the Socinian Doctrine ridicules the Christian Religion; 'Because it does not ascribe to Christ 'such Knowledg as is proper to the Supream 'God. His first Proof, is *John* 2. 25. *He knew what was in Man.* To which the Historian had before answered thus; 'The Knowledg 'which the Lord Christ had, or now in his

'State

' State of Exaltation hath, of the Secrets of ' Mens Hearts, is the pure Gift of, and Re- ' velation from God; and the *Divine Word* ' abiding on him. Rev. 1. 1. *The Revelation ' of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him, to shew ' unto his Servants.* Our Author would elude the ſtrength of this Anſwer, thus; ' This ' (ſaith he) is a plain abuſe of the Text and ' the Reaſon of it. *He knew what was in ' Man*, is the Reaſon aſſigned why he needed ' not external Information, or Teſtimony ' of Man. *He needed not that any ſhould teſtify of ' Man*, for *ἐυτὸς*, he himſelf *knew what was ' in Man*, and knew all Men. Which ac- ' cording to the propriety of Words, ſigni- ' fies an inherent Perſonal Knowledg; in op- ' poſition to any external Manifeſtation, and ' therefore to Revelation it ſelf. For he *al- ' ways* knew all Men, which cannot be done ' by Revelation; which is particular and oc- ' caſional. Here one may plainly ſee, what ſtrange ſhifts Men are put to, when they op- poſe Truth. Who denies that thoſe Words, *He knew what was in Man*, ſignify inherent Perſonal Knowledg? Can any Man know any thing but by his inherent Perſonal Knowledg? He that knows, knows *with his own Mind*, and therefore has an Inherent and Perſonal Know- ledg. But does it follow from thence, that ſuch a Knowledg is not from Revelation? I hope it may be ſaid of a Man inlightned by Revelation, that *he knows*, as well as of any other? And yet thô ſuch a Man be inſpired, he has an inherent Perſonal Knowledg; for *his own Mind* knows *inwardly* what he did not know before. But *ἐυτὸς*, ſays our Author, *he himſelf* knew; which according to the Pro- priety of Words, ſignifies an inherent Per- ſonal Knowledg *in oppoſition to Revelation.* No ſurely. For then the Prophet *Eliſha* was God, for he knew what the King of *Syria* ſpake in his Eed-chamber, 2 *Kings* 6. 12. For *ἐυτὸς*, *he himſelf* knew what the King of *Syria* ſpake: yet this was certainly by Revelation. If our Author ſhould reply, that it is well known that *Eliſha* was but a Prophet, and could know no ſuch thing but by Inſpiration or Re- velation. I anſwer, It is likewiſe well known, that Chriſt knew not all things, and particular- ly not the Day of Judgment, *Mark* 13. 32. therefore he could not be God, for God knows all things. Beſides, the Scripture aſſures us, that God gave to Chriſt his Revelation, *Rev.* 1. 1. which proves that all his extraordina- ry Knowledg was derived from God. But *he always knew all Men*, ſaith the Author, *which cannot be done by Revelation; which is par- ticular and occaſional.* Why not? God's Re- velation may be perpetual, if he pleaſes. There is no Contradiction or Impoſſibility in it. But how has he perverted the firſt Verſe of St. *John's Revelations? The Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt which God gave to him, to ſhew unto his Servants things, which muſt ſhortly come to paſs.* ' This, ſays he, doth not ſignify that this was ' a Revelation made to Jeſus Chriſt, but that ' Revelation which Chriſt made; for thô ' God is ſaid to give to him, it is *to ſhew unto ' his Servants*; that is, by appointment of ' God, Chriſt ſhewed this Revelation unto ' *John.* Alas, if our Author was not able to anſwer this place, he ſhould not have ſtudi- ed to elude it. If Chriſt made this Revelati- on, becauſe he is God, how is it ſaid *to be gi- ven to him*, which can in no ſenſe agree to him who is true God? *He received it*, ſays our Au- thor, *to ſhew unto his Servants.* But of whom can the true God receive, either Knowledg, or Authority to diſpenſe it? But here are two Arguments againſt our Author's Doctrine: 1. That God gave to Chriſt a Revelation. But he that is God can need no Revelation; becauſe himſelf knoweth all things. 2. That He is appointed to ſhew this Revelation to o- thers. Which no more can agree to one who is God, than Revelation does.

He concludes; that ' He deſires a Media- ' tor, who knows more, and in a more per- ' fect manner. But I think, 'tis fit we ſhould be contented with ſuch a Mediator, as God was pleaſed to give us.

IV. His laſt Charge is; that ' Socinianiſm ' juſtifies, at leaſt excuſes, both Pagan and ' Popiſh Idolatries; at leaſt as it is taught ' by thoſe Men, who allow of the Worſhip ' of Chriſt; which it is certain too, the ' Chriſtian Religion teaches. In

In anſwer hereto; I will, 1. Shew in what conſiſts the Worſhip or Honour due to Chriſt. 2. Compare this Worſhip, with the Worſhip which Pagans exhibited to their falſe Gods, and Papiſts to their Saints.

1. I obſerve that in the Unitarian Hypotheſis, the Worſhip or Honour due to Chriſt, is not a ſupream Worſhip; ſuch as we ought to pay to God. Chriſt being a Creature, can never be worſhipped as God is. Tho he be never ſo great and glorious, a ſupream Worſhip is proper only to Almighty God, and can never be beſtowed on any Creature. 2. As it cannot be denied, that there are divers Orders of Creatures; ſo the Honour paid to them, ought to be proportionable to their Greatneſs and Dignity. Thus, in a Kingdom thoſe, who by reaſon of their Dignity, are above the common ſort of Men, deſerve a greater Reſpect and Honour than others; and the King, who is above them all, has an Honour paid to him which is incommunicable to the reſt of his Subjects. By the ſame reaſon Angels, who are more excellent than Men, are worthy of greater Honour. But Chriſt, who has been exalted above both Men and Angels, ſince he is King of Kings and Lord of Lords, hath a proper Worſhip due to him, which can never be given either to Angels or Men. He is God's Beloved Son *by way of Excellence*, all Power is given to him in Heaven and Earth, he is at the Right-hand of God, having all things put under his Feet; he deſerves therefore an Honour, ſo much greater than theirs, as he is greater. Phil. 2. 9, 10, 11. *God alſo hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name above every Name; that at the Name of Jeſus every Knee ſhould bow, of things in Heaven, and things in Earth, and things under the Earth; and that every Tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father.* The Apoſtle does not ſay, that every Knee ought to bow at the Name of Jeſus, becauſe he is the Supream God; but becauſe God has exalted him above Men and Angels; becauſe he has *obtained* (of God) a Name above every Name, the moſt eminent and glorious Dignity that ever was. This is the true ground of the Honour which is due to Chriſt. This St. *Paul* teaches; and this the Unitarians profeſs to believe, and perform. 3. When we worſhip Chriſt, it is *to the Glory of God the Father*, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks. The Honour we pay to Chriſt, is terminated in God: we worſhip him *as God's Ambaſſador and Image*. As he who believes in him, believes in God alſo; ſo he who honours him, honours God alſo.

2. Let us compare the Worſhip of Chriſt (the Reader will remember, we mean not thereby a Supream Worſhip) with the Worſhip of Falſe Gods among *Pagans*, and of Saints among Papiſts. *Pagans* were guilty of Idolatry; becauſe, Firſt they had no Divine Command for ſuch Worſhip: but even our Author confeſſes, there is ſuch a Command for the Worſhip of Chriſt. To worſhip Creatures without the Warrant of God, is Uſurpation on, and Contempt of God. Secondly, They worſhipped and ſerved Creatures *more than the Creator*, as St. *Paul* ſays. They ſet up an infinite number of Gods, who had been meer Men; and aſcribed to them ſuch Power as did not belong to them, and ſuch Worſhip as was infinitely above them. They offered Sacrifices to them, conſecrated Temples to their Honour, prayed to them; in a word, they paid to them ſuch Worſhip, as was *terminated in them*, and ſo made True Gods of Men. But it is not ſo with the Worſhip of Chriſt. We aſcribe to him no other Power, but what we know from the Scriptures God has beſtowed on him; and no other Honour but what is proportionable to that Power, to the Dignity of his Perſon, and what God himſelf commands us to pay him. This may be applied to the Papiſts. Let them ſhow us any Text of Scripture, which obliges us to worſhip St. *Peter*, St. *Paul*, St. *Francis*. Were they content to keep within the bounds of Reſpect and Honour, due to glorified Saints, they ſhould be guilty of no Fault. But to pray to them, as many do, as Mediators both of Interceſſion *and Merit*, to dedicate Churches to them, to kneel down before their Images and to their Images,

Images, nay to their vileſt Relicks; this approaches too near to Idolatry. Our Author therefore miſtakes, when he ſays; 'The 'greateſt hurt (*on the Unitarian Hypotheſis*) 'ſeems to be, that they (*Pagans and Papiſts*) 'loſe their Labour, but according to theſe 'Principles they do no Injury to God. What then? Is it all one, to worſhip Chriſt by God's Appointment, and to worſhip Falſe Gods and (Apocryphal) Saints, without any Warrant from God? Is it all one, to pay to Chriſt ſuch Honour as neither exceeds his Power, nor is greater than his Dignity, and honour Falſe Gods and Saints, in ſuch manner as exceeds both their Power and Merit? That, is Obedience to God's Will; the Other, deteſtable Uſurpation and Rebellion. I conclude therefore, that the *Unitarians* by the Worſhip they pay to Chriſt, cannot be ſaid to juſtify or excuſe *Pagans* or *Papiſts*. Which if it had not been an invidious Charge, is ſo apparently Falſe, that it would not have deſerved any notice.

And thus I have done with that part of the Doctor's Book, which I undertook to anſwer. It may be, the Hiſtorian himſelf might, upon ſome Texts, and to ſome of our Author's Objections, have either explained or defended himſelf, otherways than is here done: and that we may, it ſeems, ſhortly ſee; unleſs Dr. *Sherlock thinks fit to own, that he deſires it not.* In the mean time, it may be the Hiſtorian is ſatisfied; that in theſe Papers, I have done wrong neither to him, nor to the Inviolable Truth of God. God be pleaſed to Inſpire Chriſtians, with the Spirit that leads into all Truth; and with that Infallible *Note of true Diſciples, to love one another*, John 13. 35.

Now to him that is of Power, to eſtabliſh us according to his Goſpel, and the preaching of Jeſus Chriſt; to God only wiſe, be Glory through Jeſus Chriſt for ever. Amen.

FINIS.

AN
Impartial Account
Of the Word
MYSTERY,
As it is taken in the
Holy Scripture.

LONDON:
Printed in the Year, M.DC.XCI.

An Impartial Account of the Word MYSTERY, *as it is taken in the Holy Scripture.*

SIR,

MYSTERY and *Perſecution* are the Tutelar God and Goddeſs of the new Syſtems, framed by Worldly Chriſtians. Upon thoſe two Antichriſtian Principles they ground all their Arguments: *Myſtery* makes up the Premiſes, and *Perſecution* the Conſequence or the Concluſion. They are indeed the two Characters of the Great Whore, arrayed in Purple and Scarlet Colour, becauſe ſhe is tainted with the Blood of the Martyrs: and ſhe has upon her Forehead a Name written, *Myſtery*, becauſe under ſuch a pretence ſhe diſplays her moſt horrid Blaſphemies. You tell me, Sir, that there have been in theſe laſt Ages ſeveral Learned Men, who have writ againſt Perſecution, and unanſwerably confuted ſo diſmal an Opinion, and ſo contrary both to the Principles of Reaſon and Religion; and you are willing that I ſhould only communicate my Thoughts to you concerning *Myſtery*. I readily comply with your Wiſhes, taking care of not running my ſelf into too tedious a Diſcuſſion.

The word *Myſtery*, which ſignifies in the general *a Hidden Thing*, is commonly taken for a Divine Secret: and I obſerve, that according to this Senſe put upon it in Religion, both the Prophane and Sacred Writers afford us a different Notion of it. 1. In the Pagan Theology the ſecret Worſhip of falſe Gods was thus ſtyl'd, ſuch as was revealed only to ſome priviledged Men, initiated into their Ceremonies, and ſo much concerned therein, as to conceal the Turpitude and Infamy thereof; but was kept ſecret from thoſe, who were called prophane, becauſe they had Knowledg and Honeſty enough to diſcover the Shamefulneſs and Ridiculouſneſs of it. Such were the Myſteries of *Ceres*, and the little Myſteries of her Daughter *Proſerpina*. In *Ægypt* in the Temple of *Iſis* and *Serapis* ſtood *Harpocrates*, the God of Silence, placed near the Images of thoſe two Gods; with his Fingers upon his Lips, to let devout Men know that it was a kind of Sacrileg to divulge the Secrets of Religion, and that the Prieſts might learn to keep ſecret that *Iſis* and *Serapis* had been *Men*. So ſacred and dangerous was the Diſcovery of Myſteries to Eccleſiaſtical Men of that time, as well as to ours: and ſuch is the love of ſuperſtitious People, of what Religion ſoever they be, for Cabal and Myſtery; becauſe they take delight in admiring what they do not underſtand, and in reverencing the very Silence of any thing that goes under the Name of Myſtery. The Heathens carried this Abuſe ſo far, that they beſtowed the Name of Myſtery upon the very Paſſions and Lewdneſs of their Gods, as it is obſerved by *Athenagoras* (*Legat. pro Chriſt.*) then Myſtery was the Cloak of Debauchery, as it is now adays the Vail of Abſurdities.

That Silence was accounted ſo ſacred, that *Horace*, tho he was no Bigot, look'd upon the breaking of it as the higheſt Crime, *Lib.* 3. *Od.* 2.

Eſt & fidèli tuta Silentio
Merces: vitabo, quæ Cereris ſacrum
Vulgarit Arcanæ, ſub iiſdem
Sit trabibus, fragilemque mecum
Solvat Phaſelum.

" A ſtrict Silence, ſays he, ſhall certainly be " rewarded: for my part, if any Man had " revealed the ſacred Myſteries of *Ceres*, I " would not venture to converſe familiarly " with him, tho we dwelt in the ſame Houſe, " or ſailed in the ſame Ship. There were at that time Rewards and Puniſhments eſtabliſhed to keep the Prieſts in a Religious Silence. And you muſt obſerve, Sir, that indiſcreet Men were then dealt with, juſt as our Excommunicated Men are now adays, or the pretended Hereticks, who pay no reſpect to Myſteries. They ſhunn'd their Company, and were afraid to meet with them under the ſame Roof. That Politick Myſtery does not much differ from a Religious Myſtery. As thoſe who are troubled with an Ulcer do carefully wrap up the affected Member, leſt any thing ſhould hurt it, or its Naſtineſs ſhould offend Peoples Eyes: Thus in Religion Men take care to diſguiſe and adorn the moſt monſtrous Opinions, which are like the Ulcer, or the Itch thereof, and ſhew a particular regard to them. They look upon them as the beloved part and the chief of Religion: And leſt they ſhould be attack'd in that weak place, they fence it with the Name of *Myſtery*. They will allow no body to touch them, nor to caſt their Eyes upon them; and aſſoon as any Man is ready to bring to light the Shamefulneſs of thoſe darling Opinions, they cry out preſently, He is an Heretick, a Blaſphemer, an Impious Man. He that undertakes to attack an Orthodox that way, is look'd upon as one who deſigns the utter ruin of Religion. They are ſo far in the right, ſeeing they cannot otherways defend their Opinions, than by frighting Children with the Wolf's Skin.

However the Cuſtom of hiding Myſteries ſprung rather from that Politick Silence, than from *Pythagoras*'s Philoſophy, either among the ancient Hereticks who were aſhamed of the Myſtery of the Croſs, or of *the Myſtery of the Crucified*, (as the Fathers ſtyle it, *Vid. Juſtin. Dial. cum Tryph.*) and durſt ſcarce confeſs that he was a Man, or among thoſe who are ſtiled the Fathers of the Church, who kept ſecret from uninitiated *Cathecumeni* the dreadful Myſteries, as they call them, being aſhamed of the Simplicity wherewith the Sacrament of the Euchariſt had been inſtituted. The former under the colour of a Myſtery, have ſo far annihilated the Sufferings and the Fleſh of Chriſt, that they left nothing to be perceived in him but an Infinite and Eternal Nature, which removed from the Jews the Scandal of his Croſs. Thus St. *Hilary*, the great Defender of the *Nicene Faith*, affirms, that our Bleſſed Saviour was free from Fear, Pain and Sorrow, vindicating againſt the *Arians* his Eternal Divinity at the coſt of his Humanity, which he thinks to be but a Fantaſm: *Putatur*, ſays he, *dolere, quia patitur; caret vero doloribus ipſe, quia Deus eſt:* (in *Pſal.* 138.) " One would " think that he feels ſome Pain, becauſe he " ſuffers; but indeed he is free from Pain, " becauſe he is God. As for the ancient Cathechiſts, they have been ſo careful to prevent their Proſelytes by thoſe great words of *Dreadful Myſteries*, that thoſe poor People when admitted unto the Lord's-Supper, thought they neither ſaw Bread nor Wine, nor any thing that might appear vile to the Eyes of wiſe Heathens by reaſon of its meanneſs. From theſe two Sources ſprang up thoſe two *Myſteries* which have the higheſt place in the Chriſtian Religion, I mean, *Conſubſtantiality* and *Tranſubſtantiation*.

2. I come in the ſecond place to the ſacred Writers. By the word *Myſtery*, they mean only a Doctrine, or an Event, which is as yet ſhut up in God's Decree, or does appear to Men only under the covering of a Prophetick Prediction, a Parable, a Symbol, a Type, or ſuch like Ænigmatick Figures; but is afterwards brought to light either by a clearer Revelation, or the Accompliſhment thereof: So that the ſame Truth that has been a Secret during a certain time, and in reſpect of ſuch a People, becomes in the time fixed by the Decree, and in reſpect of another People, an uncovered Truth. It is therefore abſolutely neceſſary to diſtinguiſh the times, the time of the Myſtery, and the time of the Revelation; and the Perſons

too;

too; that which is a Myſtery to ſome, being a clear and diſtinct Revelation to others. This I deſire you to obſerve, that you may perceive at firſt ſight, that the Scripture does never call *Myſtery*, a Thing incomprehenſible in it ſelf, tho never ſo much revealed. This Notion of a *Myſtery* is unknown to all ſorts of Authors, both Sacred and Profane. A *Myſtery* is called ſo by the former, only in reſpect of certain Circumſtances of Time, Perſons, the manner of the Revelation, *&c.* Take your Concordance, and ſee all the places of the New Teſtament, wherein that word is made uſe of, you will be amaz'd to meet with none that excites in the Mind the Idea of a Truth inconſiſtent with the Natural Lights of Senſe and Reaſon. I will confine my ſelf to the New Teſtament, becauſe, as our Divines do pretend, that Diſpenſation is moſt fruitful in ſuch Myſteries.

To make this the more intelligible, I ſhall rank all thoſe places under three Heads. The firſt contains thoſe wherein the Doctrines, the Succeſs, or the Events of the Goſpel are covered with Parables and Symbolical Terms. The ſecond contains thoſe wherein are mentioned ſome Secrets, wherewith God has intruſted ſome priviledged Prophets of his new Covenant. The third ſets before us thoſe, wherein are deſcribed God's general Diſpenſations concerning Mens Salvation, advancing from a dark and imperfect State, to a clear and perfect Revelation.

I. The Doctrines, the Succeſs, or the Events of the Goſpel are called *Myſteries*, becauſe they are covered with Parables and Symbolical Terms. The firſt place that offers it ſelf to our Enquiry, is *Matth.* 13 11. wherein our Saviour tells his Diſciples, that *it is given unto them to know the Myſteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, but unto others all things are done in Parables.* Here the Doctrines of the Kingdom of God are called *Myſteries*, not becauſe they are Incomprehenſible in themſelves and abſolutely incredible to Reaſon, but accidentally. 1. Becauſe they are wrapped up in Parables. 2. Becauſe they are propounded to incurable Men, and unworthy to be taught in the moſt intelligible way. But after all, they are revealed and diſcovered Myſteries to thoſe who were teachable, and enquired for Inſtruction: Such were the Diſciples of Chriſt, to whom *it is given to know the Myſteries*, God *revealing them to thoſe who love him*, as the Apoſtle ſaith. We read the ſame, *Mar.* 4. 11. wherein about the ſame matter relating to Parables, Chriſt calls *Myſteries* the admirable ways of the Divine Wiſdom in order to the diſcovering of His Will, and the various Succeſs which ſhall attend his Revelation, both in reſpect of the Jews and the Gentiles. The third place is to be found *Luke* 8. 10. and is the ſame with the two fore-going. *Unto you it is given*, ſays Chriſt to his Diſciples, *to know the Myſteries*, &c. whereby you may further ſee that they are Myſteries *to be known* by thoſe, who already made a right uſe not only of thoſe clear and eaſy Precepts, which are the firſt Elements of Piety, but of the moſt important and neceſſary Truths in order to Salvation.

We may place here all the Doctrines and all the Events, covered either with Types and Figures, or with Prophetick Viſions and Enigms, or with ſome weak Beginnings, which are like a Seed, wherein they are not yet perceptible. Such is that great *Myſtery* concerning *Chriſt and his Church*, of which the Union of the Husband and his Wife is a Type and a Figure, becauſe it is an Emblem of the moſt intimate and indiſſoluble Union, *Epheſ.* 6. 32. Such is *the Myſtery of the ſeven Stars*, whereby are meant the ſeven Angels, or the ſeven Biſhops of the Churches, of whom the Stars were a Type and an Emblem, *Apoc.* 1. 20. Such is *the Myſtery of God* concerning the future State of his Church, repreſented in the Viſions of St. *John*, but which is to have its Accompliſhment in the time eſtabliſhed by his Decree, *Apoc.* 10. 7. Such is *the Myſtery of the Woman* and *of the Beaſt*, Apoc. 17. 7. and *the Myſtery of Iniquity*, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 7. The one hidden in Prophetick Characters, whereby it is drawn out beforehand but after an obſcure way. The other, which is but beginning, working ſecretly by

Myſtical

Myſtical Arts, till he may act openly by his Tyranny and his Perſecution. *He comes in like a Fox, he will reign like a Lion*, as it is reported of one of his moſt profligate Children.

II. The *Myſteries* wherewith God has intruſted ſome privileged Prophets of the new Covenant, are called *Myſteries*, becauſe they are particular Prerogatives, wherewith God was pleaſed to favour their Miniſtry. Such are thoſe Gifts of the Prophets to know ſome future things, which St. *Paul* calls *Myſteries*, 1 *Cor.* 13. 1. Such are thoſe peculiar Diſpenſations, wherewith God intruſted St. *John* in the Viſions of the *Apocalypſe*, ſeveral of which he calls *Myſteries*, as I have ſhewed before. It may be alſo that this is a Reaſon why St. *Paul* calls ſo often the Vocation of the Gentiles, *a Myſtery which was revealed to him*, Eph. 3. 7, 8. meaning thereby that he had a more intimate and full Inſtruction concerning that aſtoniſhing Diſpenſation, than any of the other Apoſtles, becauſe he was the Apoſtle of the Gentiles. However we may reckon among the ſecret things which God has imparted to him by a particular favour, what he ſays *Rom.* 11. 25. *I would not, Brethren, that ye ſhould be ignorant of this Myſtery, that Blindneſs in part is happen'd to* Iſrael, *until the Fulneſs of the Gentiles be come in, and ſo all* Iſrael *ſhall be ſaved.* Here you ſee that what was before a Secret of God, being revealed to the Apoſtle by the Holy Ghoſt, has been declared to the Romans by the ſame Apoſtle, and thereby ceaſed to be a Myſtery. The Apoſtle will have them to know it, to apprehend it, and to make uſe of it to their benefit and advantage. *I would not*, ſays he, *that ye ſhould be ignorant of it*, leſt *you ſhould be wiſe in your own Conceits.* Why does he call it a Myſtery? Becauſe it was a ſecret Inſtruction wherewith his Apoſtleſhip had been adorned. To this we may add another Revelation of the ſame kind, which is called a Myſtery, becauſe it is a Secret imparted to the Apoſtle, concerning the change of thoſe who ſhall be alive in the day of the Reſurrection. *Behold* (ſays he 1 *Cor.* 15. 51.) *I ſhew you* (or I teach you) *a Myſtery, We ſhall not all ſleep, but we ſhall all be changed.* It does clearly appear from this place, that to teach, or to tell a Myſtery, does not ſignify, as our Divines pretend, to teach unintelligible Doctrines, full of Difficulties and Contradictions: For what will it avail to teach them as ſuch? But on the contrary, to teach or to tell a Myſtery, according to St. *Paul* in this place, is as much as to reveal ſome Decrees of God, which will not be fulfilled till the end of the World; it is to ſet them before us, as if we did ſee the Execution thereof; it is to reſolve Difficulties, inſtead of raiſing them; it is to free the Mind of his Reader from a Doubt that naturally ariſes concerning thoſe, who ſhall be found alive at the Coming of Chriſt. Muſt they dy to put off by Death Fleſh and Blood, and to put on a Celeſtial Body by the Power of the Reſurrection? No, ſays the Apoſtle, I will teach you a Myſtery, which will reſolve all your Difficulties, and anſwer all your Doubts upon this Point, *viz.* That thoſe who ſhall then be found alive, ſhall not need to dy, *but they ſhall be changed*, which is another way of putting off Corruption. You may ſee thereby, Sir, that when the Apoſtles tell Myſteries, they do inſtruct, reſolve Difficulties, diſcover Secrets, and enlighten our Minds: But when our Divines teach us Myſteries, they caſt us into a Labyrinth of Difficulties, which confound our Idea's, and out of which one cannot eſcape but by putting out his own Eyes.

III. The Scripture calls *Myſteries* God's general Diſpenſations, when they proceed from an obſcure and typical State, to a full and perfect Revelation, and from the Promiſe to its Accompliſhment. Under this Head are contained ten or twelve parallel Places, wherein the word *Myſtery* is taken in the ſame ſenſe, *viz. Rom.* 16. 25, 26. 1 *Cor.* 2. 7, 10. & 4. 1. *Eph.* 1. 9, 10. & 3. 3, 4, 5, 9, 10. & 6. 19. *Col.* 1. 26, 27. & 2. 2. & 4. 3, 4. 1 *Tim.* 3. 9, 16. Some of thoſe places are explained, and ſhew us, that what was a Myſtery in the precedent Ages, as the Vocation

tion of the Gentiles, &c. is clearly revealed under the Goſpel: The Doctrines of Salvation, which were before hidden either in God's Decree, or in the Promiſes made to the Fathers, or in the Types of the Law, or in the Predictions of the Prophets, as in their Seed, are now delivered in a moſt evident manner by the Apoſtles and the Prophets of the Lord, to whom they have been fully revealed by the Spirit of the Lord. Any that can but read, will ſoon perceive in theſe places ſo clear and ſo palpable a Truth. The other are more generally expreſſed, wherein that *Myſtery* is called only, *the Myſtery of God, the Myſtery of Chriſt, the Myſtery of the Goſpel, the Myſtery of Faith, the Myſtery of Godlineſs*. But beſides the words of *delivering* and *manifeſting*, which are often joyned in thoſe general Expreſſions, every body may plainly ſee, that thoſe great Titles are Encomiums and Honourable Names, wherewith the Apoſtles adorn the Evangelical Diſpenſation, and that being put together, the meaning of them is only, that the Goſpel is the Secret of God's Will, which has been revealed by Chriſt, and propounded to our Faith to be the Rule of our Piety and Obedience.

But perhaps you are willing, Sir, that I ſhould explain thoſe places one after another. This will be no hard matter after the two general Reflections which I made already. I begin with thoſe wherein the Vocation of the Gentiles is more expreſly contained.

Rom. 16. 25, 26. *Now to him that is of Power to ſtabliſh us according to my Goſpel, and the preaching of Jeſus Chriſt (according to the Revelation of the Myſtery, which was kept ſecret ſince the World began; but now is made manifeſt, and by the Scriptures of the Prophets, according to the Commandment of the Everlaſting God, made known to all Nations for the Obedience of Faith.)* &c. St. *Paul* calls in this place the Goſpel *the Revelation of a Myſtery, a Myſtery hidden* both to Men and Angels *in all the precedent Ages*, but at that time *a Myſtery manifeſted by his preaching*, which has unfolded the ancient Prophecies, and brought to light the Secret of the Vocation of the Gentiles, which had been but obſcurely foretold by the Prophets.

1 Cor. 2. 7, 10. *But we ſpeak the Wiſdom of God in a Myſtery, even the hidden Wiſdom which God ordained before the World unto our Glory.* Ver. 10. *But God has revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit ſearcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.* The Apoſtle ſpeaks ſtill in the place of the Goſpel's Diſpenſation, which he calls *the Wiſdom of God in a Myſtery*, which God kept to himſelf in the Secret of his Counſel before there were either Men or Angels, to whom he might communicate it, but which he prepared nevertheleſs from that very time, for the Glory and Happineſs of his Children, and which at laſt *he has revealed by his Spirit*, that we may have a clear and efficacious knowledg of it, and be thereby led to the worſhipping of him.

Eph. 1. 9, 10. *Having made known unto us the Myſtery of his Will, according to his good pleaſure, which he purpoſed in himſelf: That in the Diſpenſation of the fulneſs of Times, he might gather together in one all things in Chriſt, both which are in Heaven, and which are on Earth, even in him.* The Myſtery ſpoken of in this place is *a Myſtery of God's Will*. This Will conſiſts in ſaving the Gentiles, by calling them to the Faith of Chriſt, and *in reducing alſo all the Inhabitants of Heaven and Earth* into one Family, and *under one Head*, viz. *Chriſt*. God, who from all Eternity deſigned this great Work with himſelf, has diſpenſed it by his own Son in *the fulneſs of Times*, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks here; or *when the fulneſs of Time was come*, as he ſays *Gal.* 4. 4. That is to ſay, in the Time fixed by God's Decree, which is a time of Revelation and of Light, as the foregoing Times were Times of Myſtery.

Eph. 3. 3, 4, 5, 9, 10. *How that by Revelation he made known unto me the Myſtery (as I wrote afore in few words, whereby when ye read ye may underſtand my Knowledg in the Myſtery of God) which in other Ages was not made known unto the Sons of Men, as it is now revealed unto his holy Apoſtles and Prophets by the Spirit; That the Gentiles ſhould be fellow-*

heirs,

heirs, and of the ſame Body, and Partakers together of his Promiſe in Chriſt, by the Goſpel. Ver. 9. *And to make all Men ſee, what is the Fellowſhip of the Myſtery, which from the beginning of the World has been hid in God, who created all things by Jeſus Chriſt: To the intent that now unto the Principalities and Powers in Heavenly Places, might be known by the Church the manifold Wiſdom of God.* This place may ſerve for a Commentary upon all the other, ſo clearly the Apoſtle explains his Mind in it. The Myſtery ſpoken of by him is a Secret concerning *the Salvation of the Gentiles, fellow-Heirs of the Divine Promiſes with the Jews,* and Partakers of the ſame Graces, and Members *of the ſame Body,* in the Fellowſhip of the ſame Spirit. This was *a Secret unknown* to Men and Angels, but throughly made known to the Apoſtles by God's Revelation, to the Prophets of the New Teſtament by the Holy Ghoſt, and even to Angels by the means of the Church. Indeed St. *Paul* calls this Myſtery *the Incomprehenſible Riches of Chriſt.* But does he mean thereby, that they are ſuch Doctrines as Reaſon cannot attain to, ſo obſcure and ſo contrary to its Light? God forbid we ſhould aſcribe to him ſo unreaſonable a Senſe! In his Senſe, and according to the Genius of all his Epiſtles, they are Graces and Bleſſings of Chriſt ſo rich and ſo plentiful, that they are extended even to the Nations, which had been hitherto accounted the moſt profane and unworthy of God's Mercy. They are Bleſſings ſo much above our Admiration and our Praiſes, that our Minds are confounded with the Excellency, the Extent, and the number of them. In ſuch a Senſe we grant that there are ſome Myſteries in the Chriſtian Religion, ſome incomprehenſible Secrets; Secrets of Salvation, and Myſteries of Love, which may be compared to a bottomleſs Sea.

Col. 1. 26, 27. *Even the Myſtery which has been hid from Ages, and from Generations, but now is made manifeſt to his Saints: To whom God would make known what is the Riches of the Glory of this Myſtery among the Gentiles, which is Chriſt in you the hope of Glory.* This Text needs no Paraphraſe. The Apoſtle calls here a Myſtery the Will of God, whereby he is willing to ſave all Nations indifferently, which he will make a proper and peculiar People to himſelf, not by Circumciſion and other Ceremonies of the Law, but by the purifying of them only through the Faith of Chriſt. He makes here the ſame Diſtinction as in all the other places which we have examin'd, and which puts an end to our Queſtion, *viz.* That what was *a Myſtery,* or a Doctrine *hidden in all the Ages which preceded the Goſpel,* is now *diſcovered to the Saints,* to the Apoſtles and to the Prophets of the Lord, to whom God has been pleaſed to make known the glorious Riches of his Mercy, which he beſtows upon *the Gentiles.* And he adds in expreſs words, that this Myſtery is nothing but *Chriſt himſelf,* whom they have received, and who has brought to them by his magnificent Promiſes *the certain hopes of Glory.*

I come now to thoſe Texts wherein the Myſtery of the Goſpel is mentioned in a more general manner.

1 Cor. 4. 1. *Let a Man ſo account of us, as of the Miniſters of Chriſt, and Stewards of the Myſteries of God.* Who does not perceive at firſt ſight, that the Title which the Apoſtles aſcribe to themſelves, of being *the Stewards of the Myſteries of God,* is the ſame with the immediately foregoing of being *the Miniſters of Chriſt?* As if they ſhould ſay, We are the Miniſters of Chriſt, who diſpenſe the Treaſures of his Knowledg, and the Purpoſes of God concerning the Salvation of Mankind: Purpoſes hitherto kept ſecret, but we have been intruſted with the Revelation of them. God had as it were made a rich Store of Graces, which he kept in his own Boſom, out of which the Apoſtles his faithful Stewards diſpenſe them to thoſe for whom they were deſigned. And God by their preaching lays his Bowels of Mercy open to us, and diſplays to our Eyes the vaſt Riches of his Grace, and of his Salvation.

Eph. 6. 19. *And for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my Mouth boldly, to make known the Myſtery of the Goſpel.*

The

The preaching of St. *Paul* is here called in expreſs words *the Myſtery* of the Goſpel, that is, the Revelation of Salvation. The Apoſtle ſays, that tho he be loaded with Chains, for having declared to the Gentiles the Secret of Mercy, yet he goes on in the performance of his Miniſtry with freedom and boldneſs, laying open to all Men the bleſſed Immortality attainable by the Faith of Chriſt.

Col. 2. 2. *That their Hearts might be comforted, being knit together in Love, and unto all the Riches of the full aſſurance of underſtanding, to the acknowledgment of the Myſtery of God, and of the Father, and of Chriſt.* It cannot be doubted but that this *Myſtery of God the Father, and of Jeſus Chriſt*, ſpoken of in this place, is alſo the Goſpel-Diſpenſation concerning the Salvation of all Mankind, which the Father has revealed to us by the Miniſtry of his Son. For beſides, that this is the ordinary Style of the Apoſtle, as often as he is diſcourſing of this Divine Will, and that it is the Senſe, which he has fixed upon the words [*Myſtery of God and of Jeſus Chriſt*] as we have ſeen in the places before explained. Beſides that, I ſay, this does appear from the very words of the Text, which offers to us an Object that may be known to us, and which we may have not only the knowledg of, but *a firm and certain Knowledg*, not only ſome Knowledg, but *Riches of Knowledg*, that is, a full Knowledg, which takes off all Obſcurity and Doubts.

Col. 4. 3. *Withal, praying alſo for us, that God would open unto us a Door of Utterance, to ſpeak the Myſtery of Chriſt, for which I am alſo in Bonds.* This place is parallel to *Eph.* 6. 19. which we have explained. You ſee in both places the Apoſtle in Bonds, he intreats his Brethren to pray for him, that God would be pleaſed to unlooſe his Tongue, to open a Door to him, and to grant him an opportunity of freely preaching *the Myſtery of Jeſus Chriſt*, or of the Goſpel; that is to ſay, the Doctrine of Salvation by the Faith of Chriſt. And he mentions, *ver.* 4. not only the preaching of it, but alſo the diſcovering of it to Men, as a Secret which he ought to make them Partakers of.

1 Tim. 3. 9. *Holding the Myſtery of the Faith in a pure Conſcience.* Ver. 16. *And without controverſy, great is the Myſtery of Godlineſs: God was manifeſt in the Fleſh, juſtified in the Spirit, ſeen of Angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the World, received up into Glory. The Myſtery of Faith* and *the Myſtery of Godlineſs* ſignifies here *the Myſtery of the Chriſtian Faith and Godlineſs* in the ſame Senſe (the reaſon of Contraries being obſerved) as *the Myſtery of Iniquity*, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 7. The Chriſtian Faith was in preceding Ages a hidden Secret, and kept under the obſcurity of the Prophecies, and ſhadows of the Law: and the Apoſtle will have it in this place, by a fine and elegant Alluſion, to be held and kept in a good Conſcience as in a precious Veſſel; that is to ſay, that Faith and Righteouſneſs be indiſſolubly united, otherwiſe Faith will ſoon become ſhipwrack'd, unleſs it be made ſtedfaſt by a good Conſcience. Wherefore we are exhorted to make ſure our Vocation and Election by good Works.

I have confounded thoſe two places, becauſe there ſeems to be no more Myſtery in the one than in the other; yet I think my ſelf obliged to examin more particularly the latter, and that becauſe it ſeems to favour a little the Notion of a Myſtery which I am confuting. *Without controverſy, great is the Myſtery of Godlineſs, God was manifeſted in the Fleſh*, &c. 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. This ſeems to countenance the Myſtery of the Incarnation, as they call it. It ſeems, I ſay, for there is no reality in it.

For, *Firſt*, It is more likely that the word *God* has been foiſted into the Original. We have good reaſon to believe this, and I intend to ſhew you that the Apoſtle ſpeaks here of the Myſtery of Godlineſs, or rather of the Goſpel.

1. Many Greek Copies, the moſt antient and the moſt conſiderable, the Oriental Verſions, the Vulgar, and ſome Fathers, read conſtantly *which* inſtead of *God*, *Great is the Myſtery of Godlineſs*, [*which*] *was manifeſted in the Fleſh*, &c. This is there-

fore the Secret of the Goſpel, the great Secret of Salvation, which was preached up and delivered, not by Angels, as the Law was, but by *Mortal Men*; not by a conquering *Meſſias*, as the Jews expected he ſhould be, but by one that underwent *Sufferings and Temptations*. Cannot the Orthodox triumph over the Hereticks without falſifying the Text of the Scripture, and leaving to the World a Shameful Monument of their want of Sincerity? The Latin Church has not falſified her Verſion, nor ſuffer'd that it ſhould be falſified. Her Faith concerning this Myſtery could not allow her to do that. Nor have the Hereticks falſified it, who were Maſters of the ancient Copies, that remain to this day, and upon which, or ſuch like, the Oriental and Occidental Verſions of the Church were made. This is therefore a Miracle of God's Providence, who was pleaſed to preſerve to us the precious Remainders of his Truth, notwithſtanding the Endeavours of thoſe who never loved it.

2. It is plain, that this Title, *the Myſtery of Godlineſs*, is like the other which we have cited, and are undeniably aſcribed to the Goſpel, *viz. the Myſtery of God, the Myſtery of Chriſt, the Myſtery of the Goſpel, the Myſtery of Faith*. In effect, in St. *Paul*'s Stile, the word *Myſtery* is conſtantly beſtowed upon the *great Secret* of the Divine Love, concerning the Salvation of Mankind, eſpecially of the Gentiles, which is the ordinary matter of his Tranſports, and Admiration. If the Doctrines, which go now under the Names of Aſtoniſhing Myſteries, had been look'd upon as ſuch by that holy Man, how could he lay them aſide, without ſhewing his Aſtoniſhment, and beſtowing his Encomiums upon them? If it be replied, that he has done ſo in this place; then they muſt confeſs that this is the only place. But is there any likelihood that the holy Apoſtle ſhould admire at every ſtep the profound Riches of God's Mercy towards the Gentiles, as raviſhing Myſteries, and that he ſhould have cried out, O Myſtery! but once, contemplating the incomprehenſible Depths of the Trinity and the Incarnation?

It is more natural to think, that he has not changed the uſual Idea which he ties to the word *Myſtery*. And,

3. My third Argument will fully convince us of it. The ſame Qualities which are aſcribed to the Doctrine of Salvation contained in the Goſpel, and which are (if I may ſay ſo) inſeparable from it in the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, are here attributed to *the Myſtery of Godlineſs*. It is called a *manifeſted Secret*, an Expreſſion only ſutable to God's Will; and *manifeſted in the Fleſh*, that is, by the Fleſh, (as *juſtified in the Spirit* ſignifies juſtified by the Spirit) *God having put this Treaſure in Earthen Veſſels*, or in *Fleſhly* Veſſels, which is all one. *The Fleſh*, in the Stile of the Hebrews, ſignifies not only *infirm and mortal* Men, but Men of a low and poor Condition, ſimple plain Men, without Learning, without Greatneſs, without any Appearance, ſuch as the Meſſias and his Apoſtles were, Men born of mean Parents, Carpenters, or Fiſhers, and who had never been bred up in Schools. But God has ſupported the Infirmity of his Miniſters by the Greatneſs of the Miracles which they wrought. This the Apoſtle means by the words, *juſtified by the Spirit*, becauſe by ſuch means *the weak and fooliſh things of God have confounded the Power and the Philoſophy of this World*, 1 Cor. 1. 27. Now if you retain the word *God*, what would be the meaning of this Expreſſion, *God juſtified by the Spirit?* What a ſtrange Language! The Apoſtle adds, that this Secret *was ſeen of Angels*, who *deſired* (ſaith St. *Peter*, 1 Pet. 1. 12.) *to look into the Goſpel*, which has been preached to us, that it *was preached to the Gentiles and believed in the World:* which words do plainly ſhew that this Myſtery is nothing elſe but the preaching of the Goſpel out of the Borders of *Judea*, and the Vocation of the Gentiles, that great Secret of God's Will, which did ſo much ſurprize the Apoſtles of our Lord, and which is in all the Epiſtles of St. *Paul* called a Myſtery, whenever he treats of it. This certainly ſhews that he has not fixed a new Idea upon

on that word in this place, and that he always underſtands thereby a Miracle of God's Mercy, who calls his People thoſe that were not his People, not the pretended Myſtery of the Incarnation, which never was the Subject of the Apoſtles preaching, nor the Object of the Faith of the Gentiles. Indeed one muſt be very ſubtile to find the Incarnation in the ancient Rules of their Faith, which they profeſt at their Baptiſm.

4. Theſe words *received up into Glory*, cannot agree with the Exaltation of the incarnate Word. The Greek Phraſe cannot bear ſuch a ſenſe (ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ, does not ſignify *receptus in Gloriam, received up into Glory*; but *receptus in Gloriâ vel cum Gloriâ, received with Glory*). From whence it follows, that it muſt be meant of God's Will revealed in the Goſpel, which having been made manifeſt, was received with Glory and Applauſe, or embraced in a glorious and triumphing manner. I ſhall confirm this Explication with the words of *Eraſmus* upon this place. *Mihi ſubolet* (ſays he) *Deum additum fuiſſe adverſus Hereticos Arianos. Ceterum mea quidem ſententia, ſimpliciſſima fuerit interpretatio, ſi quis Myſterium intelligat prædicationem Evangelii, quod ſæpe alias Myſterium vocat, prius occultum, nunc manifeſtum univerſo Mundo:* That is, "I am apt to think "that the word *God* was here added againſt "the Hereticks the Arians. Now this ſeems "to me the moſt ſimple Interpretation, if "by the word *Myſtery* we underſtand the "preaching of the Goſpel, which the Apo"ſtle calls often a Myſtery in ſeveral o"ther places, a Myſtery before hidden "and unknown, but now made manifeſt "to all the World.

Secondly, Suppoſe we ought to read, *God was manifeſted in the Fleſh:* that word *God*, eſpecially when put without an Article, as it is here, ſignifies only *God's Word, Doctrine, or Attributes*, manifeſted by the preaching of Chriſt and his Apoſtles; as *Ariſtotle*, ſignifies *the Philoſophy of* Ariſtotle; Moſes, *the Law of that Prophet*; *Chriſt, the Doctrine, or the Goſpel of Chriſt*. This is clear of it ſelf; and if we wanted ſome Teſtimonies, Doctor *Sherlock* would afford us one in the very beginning of his Book concerning *the Knowledg of Chriſt*, where he fully proves this Truth. "*Chriſt* (ſays he) ſignifies the "Goſpel and Religion of Chriſt, as *Moſes* "ſignifies the Writings and Laws of *Moſes*, "and the *Prophets* the Writings and Ser"mons of the Prophets, *Luke* 16. 29, 31. "And there is nothing more uſual in com"mon Speech, then to call any Laws, or "Religion, or Philoſophy, by the Names "of the firſt Authors. Thus *Gal.* 5. 15. "*Col.* 2. 8. *Eph.* 4. 20, 21. where Chriſt "muſt ſignify not the Perſon, but the Reli"gion or Goſpel of Chriſt. It remains therefore that I ſhould produce ſome places, wherein the word *God* is put for the Will of God, or the Revelation of his Glorious Perfections. Dr. *Sherlock* will alſo eaſe us of that labour; for he has done it in the ſame Book: He cites *Mat.* 11. 27. *No Man knows the Father ſave the Son*, &c. which he paraphraſes thus. "God has now committed "unto Chriſt all the ſecret Purpoſes of his "Counſel concerning the Salvation of Man"kind, which were concealed from Ages. "None of the Prophets who lived before, "did ſo fully underſtand it, nor have we "any other certain way of knowing this, "but by the Revelation which Chriſt has "made to us. And *John* 14. 7. *If ye had "known me, ye ſhould have known the Fa"ther, alſo*, &c. *Whoever knows me*, i. e. (*ſays the Author*) whoever is acquainted "with the Doctrine and Religion I preach, "knows my Father, *i. e.* is throughly in"ſtructed in God's Mind and Will. So "that to know God, is to underſtand the "Will of God, concerning the Salvation of "Mankind. And *Heb.* 1. 1. *The Brightneſs "of his Father's Glory, and the expreſs Image "of his Perſon.* Theſe Diſcoveries, *ſays that "Author*, Chriſt has made of God, being "a bright and glorious Reflection of the "Nature and Attributes of God, of his "Eternal Wiſdom, and Truth and Holi"neſs, are as true a Repreſentation of the

" Divine Nature and Will, as any Picture " is of the Perſon it repreſents. It is plain " that in this ſenſe Chriſt is called *the Image* " *of God*, 2 *Cor.* 4. 4. where Chriſt being " the Image of God comes in very abrupt- " ly, unleſs we underſtand it in this ſenſe, " that he is the Image of God, with re- " ſpect to the glorious Revelations of the " Goſpel, which contain a true and faith- " ful account of God's Nature and Will. " And *Joh.* 1. 18. *No Man hath ſeen God* " *at any time*, &c. That is, *ſays the Author*, " no Man ever before had ſo perfect a " knowledg of the Will of God, (which is " here called ſeeing God, becauſe Sight " gives us the cleareſt Evidence, and the " moſt perfect and particular Knowledg) " but the Son of God, who perfectly un- " derſtood all his moſt ſecret Counſels, hath " perfectly declared the Will of his Fa- " ther to us. So *Joh.* 1. 16. *And of his* " *Fulneſs have all we received*, &c. And *Col.* 2 9. " *In him dwelleth all the Fulneſs of the Godhead* " *bodily*, are explained by the Author thus: " 'Tis not the Perſonal Fulneſs we are to " attend to, but the Fulneſs and Perfection " of the Goſpel, from whence we muſt " fetch the Knowledg of the Divine Will. " The Fulneſs of the Godhead is an Allu- " ſive and Metaphorical Expreſſion; for " God, who is a Spirit, cannot, in a pro- " per ſenſe, dwell bodily in any thing. I hope now no body will wonder, that by theſe words, *God was manifeſted in the Fleſh*, I ſhould underſtand only the Grace and the Will of God, which have been manifeſted unto us by the preaching of a *Meſſias*, and of a company of Fiſhermen, who neither were *ſtrong nor noble according to the Fleſh*, no more than their Proſelytes, 1 *Cor.* 1. 20. Which ſhews that our Copies, though differing in words, yet agree in ſenſe; becauſe as often as God manifeſts his Deſigns, eſpecially the Secrets of his Love, and of his Mercy, ſuch as he reveals them in Chriſt Jeſus, with a ſhining Glory and a plentiful Profuſion, then God manifeſts himſelf, and makes himſelf viſible to Men, diſplaying to their Eyes through theſe Images all the Riches of his Glory, Wiſdom, Power, Love and Faithfulneſs.

Now to put an end to the Explication of all thoſe places, there remains only one Queſtion to be anſwered, *viz.* Why the Goſpel, being the cleareſt and the moſt perfect of all Revelations, is called a *Myſtery?* Beſides ſeveral particular Reaſons, which I have before mentioned in examining every place by it ſelf, I ſhall here inſiſt upon two general ones.

1. This Speech is like that which we make uſe of, when we call a Secret ſtill, a Deſign which we have communicated to ſome Perſons, whilſt it lies hidden to ſome others, and that we ſay, *ſuch and ſuch are intruſted with my Secret, few are intruſted with my Secret.* The Goſpel being in effect a Secret of God's Will revealed to certain Nations, but hidden to others, to whom, comparatively to thoſe who know it already, it is a Myſtery ſtill.

2. It is called ſo in the ſame ſenſe that it is ſaid, *the Blind ſee*, being ſtyl'd blind after they have recovered their Sight; a blind Man ſeeing, and a Myſtery revealed, being like Expreſſions: and in the ſame ſenſe that *Harlots* are ſaid *to go before others into the Kingdom of God*, being called Harlots even after their Converſion. The Scriptures are full of the like Expreſſions. Thus Myſteries, though revealed, are called Myſteries ſtill, to commend thereby the Grace and Love of God towards thoſe to whom he imparts his Secrets. All this is a Confirmation of my foregoing Obſervation, that the Myſtery of God is nothing leſs than a thing unintelligible and incomprehenſible to Reaſon, and leaſt of all an Object which contradicts and deſtroys our Natural Ideas. It is called ſo only with reſpect to ſome Circumſtances of Time, Place and Perſon.

However, all theſe Myſteries, as long as they continue to be Myſteries, and God has ſome Reaſons to hide his Deſigns with the Obſcurity of Prophecies, and to cover them with a Vail, do not bind Chriſtians to have a clear and diſtinct Faith and Knowledg concerning the Objects contained in them,

them, under pain of Damnation. When the Object is vail'd, Faith muſt needs be confuſed and implicite. This is the unjuſt Practice of Divines, to damn, with their own Authority, the ſuppoſed Hereticks, who refuſe to embrace in an explicite manner Myſteries, which, ſuppoſing them to be true, are ſo incomprehenſible (as they own themſelves) that for that very reaſon they are capable of no Interpretation, nor conſequently, fit to be diſtinctly believed. Thoſe falſe Myſteries have no ground in the New Teſtament, as I have ſhewed, to appropriate that Title to themſelves, except it be in the firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 14. 2. the only Paſſage which remains to be examined; where the Apoſtle, diſcourſing of him who ſpeaks in an unknown Tongue, ſays, that *in the Spirit he ſpeaketh Myſteries.* Indeed their Metaphyſical Gibberiſh is a Barbarous and unknown Tongue, full of thoſe *Myſteries in Spirit*, and of frighting Abſurdities. By the means of Myſtery, Divines have made Religion a very difficult thing, that is, an Art which Chriſtians are not able to underſtand. *Ex Religione Ars facta*, ſays *Grotius*, (*De Ver. Relig. Chriſt.* lib. 6.) Thereby they raiſed themſelves above common Chriſtians, and are made neceſſary to the People, improving that Art to their own benefit. If Religion were eaſy, and without any encumbrance, then every one ſhould be Doctor to himſelf. But Clergymen have done like Phyſicians, who have kept ſtill to *Hippocrates*'s extravagant Expreſſions, and make uſe of far-fetch'd Drugs, leſt their Art become too common in uſing Herbs of our own Gardens, and Terms of our vulgar Tongue. Chriſtianity is by that means nothing elſe but the Religion of Learned Men, and of the moſt ſubtile and refin'd Philoſophers. Thoſe are eſteem'd the moſt excellent Chriſtians, who believe moſt Myſteries. Men will by no means have a Religion of a level, which neither *aſcends into Heaven*, nor *deſcends into the Deep*, and whoſe whole Myſtery is *nigh us, in the Faith of the Heart, and in the Confeſſion of the Mouth. If thou ſhalt confeſs with thy Mouth the Lord Jeſus, and ſhalt believe in thine Heart, that God has raiſed him from the Dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved.* Rom. 10. 9. This has been rightly obſerved by Dr. *Sherlock* himſelf in his Book *of the Knowledg of Chriſt*, p. 273. "Let us leave, *ſays* "*he*, thoſe dim Notions to Men who can "believe what no Man can underſtand, who "deſpiſe every thing that can be under-"ſtood, as if it were no better than Car-"nal Reaſon. *Deſiring to be Teachers of the Law* (ſays St. *Paul*, 1 Tim. 1. 7.) *underſtanding neither what they ſay, nor whereof they affirm.*

We may therefore conclude, Sir, that the Goſpel is ſo far from being a Myſtery and a Secret, that it is the moſt evident and the cleareſt of all Revelations. Divine Truth is not hid in a Well, as *Democritus* ſaith: it is like a City ſtanding upon a Hill, which may be ſeen of all Men. Chriſt has brought all things to light, and as the Woman of *Samaria* ſpeaks, *He has taught us all things.* He is called *a Word*, not *a Silence*; his Goſpel is a Revelation, not a Myſtery. Indeed he forbids us to caſt his holy Doctrine *before Dogs and Swine*; but on the other hand, he will have it to be made plain and intelligible to any Man, who heartily deſires to know it. We ought to leave that covered and myſtical Philoſophy to *Heraclitus*, who was wont to tell his Diſciples, *Darken your Thoughts, and never expreſs your ſelves but enigmatically, leſt you ſhould be underſtood of the People.* Such an Affectation of Obſcurity was the occaſion of *Ariſtotle*'s being called *a Sphinx*, who did always propound inexplicable Riddles: Nay, it is reported, that by that means he inſinuated himſelf into *Alexander*'s Favour, and comforted that Prince, who was afraid leſt the Myſteries of the Acroamatick Philoſophy ſhould grow too common. I know it is commonly ſaid, that there are ſome Myſteries which Chriſt did not teach, becauſe they were too high and too ſublime for the Church, which was then in her Infancy, and conſequently, that the perfect Revela-

tion

tion thereof was deferr'd till the coming down of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, and thereupon they cite *John.* 16. 12, 13. But Dr. *Sherlock* will answer this for me; for he says in the Book before mentioned, "That this place does not speak of any "Doctrine necessary to Salvation, but only "of certain Instructions relating to the Nature or Extent of the Apostle's Ministry: "As for Example, the Vocation of the "Gentiles, which is often called a Mystery, and consequently, that the perfect "Revelation thereof could not be deferr'd "to a more seasonable time. For, *as he "goes on*, if the Apostles had preached "any other thing in matters relating to "Salvation, than what Christ had taught "them, they should have preached another Gospel, which was to be rejected, "*Gal.* 1. 8, 9. *He adds*, This I do not say "to lessen the Authority of the Apostles, "who could teach nothing but what they "had learn'd; nor make any Doctrine necessary, but what was made such by "Christ: *But to awaken those Men who take "little notice of the Gospel of our Saviour, "while they fetch all their mysterious Divinity "out of some obscure Passages of St.* Paul's "*Epistles*, 2 Pet. 3. 16. Yet upon those "obscure places they ground their Faith, "without taking care to consider, whether "they agree with the Gospel of Christ, "which is the first Rule, and yet is perfectly "silent about those pretended grounds. If therefore we must examine the very Passages of the Apostles according to this Rule, how much more the mysterious Terms contrived by the Councils and Divines?

I do not know from whence they fetch that Spirit of Mystery. Certainly the reading of the Gospel will never suggest it, seeing the Holy Ghost does his utmost Endeavour to make the Revelation as plain and intelligible to us as can be. As for Doctrines, the Doctrine of the Cross, which *is a Stumbling-block to the Jews, and Foolishness to the Greeks*, it is set therein before us with the greatest Evidence, and we see all at once the whole Wisdom of its Scope, Uses, Effects, *&c.* As for the invisible Promise of a future Life: he makes us to handle it with St. *Thomas* in the Wounds of Christ raised from the Dead, after he had suffer'd for God's sake. As for Precepts; God has sent us a Preacher, who first observes them, before he imposes them upon others, and thrô the Pattern of his Obedience which he left to us, he plainly lets us see the possibility thereof. Every thing therefore is plain in the Divine Revelation, and instead of spiritualizing sensible things, it makes the most spiritual and imperceptible things, plain and sensible to us: God himself, though invisible, manifesting himself in Jesus Christ, who is his Character and visible Image. God, who could have sent Angels to us (which would be suitable to the mystical and abstruse Doctrines of Divines) to teach us the Tongue of Angels, and acquaint us with their *System*, has been willing to accommodate himself to our limited Knowledg, by sending us a Man like unto us, who spoke the Language of Men, and who did so far condescend in the System of Doctrine, which he left to us, that we may not only say, that we heard him with our Ears, but saw him with our Eyes, and handled him with our Hands. Besides, God who might have sent us some Philosophers, acquainted with *Plato*'s and *Aristotle*'s Notions, was willing to comply with the meanness of our Minds, by causing his Gospel to be preached by Publicans and Fishermen of *Galilee*, who never heard of *Consubstantiality* and *Hypostasis*, and yet less of *Perichoresis* and *Apotelesm*. Hereupon Dr. *Sherlock*'s Astonishment is worth the noting (*Ubi supr.* p. 131.) "I know not, *says he*, whence it "comes to pass, that Men love to make "plain things obscure, and like nothing in "Religion but Riddles and Mysteries. God "indeed was pleased to institute a great many Ceremonies (and many of them of "very obscure Signification) in the Jewish "Worship, to awe their Childish Minds "into a greater Veneration of his Divine "Majesty. But in these last days, God "hath

" hath ſent his own Son into the World " to make a plain, and eaſy, and perfect " Revelation of his Will, to publiſh ſuch " a Religion as may approve it ſelf to our " Reaſon, and captivate our Affections by " its natural Charms and Beauties. And " there cannot be a greater Injury to the " Chriſtian Religion, than to render it ob- " ſcure and unintelligible. And yet too " many there are, who deſpiſe every thing " which they underſtand, and think nothing " a ſufficient Trial of their Faith, but " what contradicts the Senſe and Reaſon of " Mankind.

Let us follow the Doctor a ſtep further; he will diſcover to us the two Sources of that Abuſe (*ubi ſupr.* p. 69, *&c.*) by making us obſerve; " That there are two ways of " expounding Scripture in great vogue a- " mong Men. Firſt, by the ſound and " clink of Words and Phraſes, which is " all ſome Men underſtand, by *keeping a form* " *of ſound Words*. Secondly, when this will " not do, they reaſon about the Senſe of " Scripture from their own pre-conceived " Notions and Opinions, and prove that " this muſt be the meaning of Scripture, " becauſe otherwiſe it is not reconcileable " to their Dreams, which is called expound- " ing Scripture by *the Analogy of Faith* —— " 'Tis no wonder, *ſays he*, if Men can ac- " commodate Scripture-Expreſſions to their " own Dreams and Fancies. For when " Mens Fancies are ſo poſſeſt with Shews " and Ideas of Religion, whatever they look " on appears of the ſame ſhape and colour, " wherewith their Minds are already tin- " ctured; like a Man ſick of the Jaundice, " or that look'd through a painted Glaſs, " who ſees every thing of the ſame colour " that his Eye or Glaſs gives it. All the " Metaphors, and Similitudes, and Allego- " ries of Scripture are eaſily applied to " their purpoſe. And if any word ſounds " like the tinkling of their own Fancies, it " is no leſs than a Demonſtration that *that* " is the meaning of the Spirit of God; and " every little ſhadow and appearance doth " mightily confirm them in their pre-con- " ceived Opinions. As *Irenæus* obſerves of " the *Valentinians*, that they uſed one Arti- " fice or other to adapt all the Speeches of " our Saviour to, and all the Allegories of " Scripture, *malè compoſito Phantaſmati,* " *to the ill-contrived Figment of their own* " *Brain*. And thus the Minds of Men are " abuſed with Words and Phraſes, and the " Scripture is preſt to ſerve every new- " fangled conceit in Religion. The Doctor goes on after the ſame rate, and I make no doubt but you will like what remains to be tranſcribed upon this Subject, nor could I ſay any thing more ſuitable to the matter in hand. " The wildeſt, *ſays he*, and moſt ex- " travagant Opinions that were ever yet " vented under the Name of Religion, have " pretended the Authority of Scripture for " their Patronage. Though any unpreju- " diced Man would wonder how the reading " ſuch places of Scripture ſhould ſuggeſt ſuch " Notions to them. But this is no wonder, " when we conſider that Men firſt contrive " their Religion, and poſſeſs their Fancy " throughly with their private Opinions, " and then read the Scripture with no other " deſign, than to find ſome thing there to " ſtamp Divinity on their own Conceits. " For it is eaſy to pervert the plaineſt " Senſe, and by the help of a ſtrange Ima- " gination to make any thing of any thing. " Such Men dote upon Words and Phraſes, " Metaphors and Alluſions, as beſt fitted for " their purpoſe: They found their Religion " on obſcure Texts, or Myſtical Interpre- " tations of plain Texts, and by the help " of ſome Arbitrary Diſtinctions and Limi- " tations, Gloſſes and Paraphraſes, by cur- " tailing of Texts, or tranſplacing Words " or Comma's, or ſeparating a ſingle Sen- " tence from the Body of the Diſcourſe, " make the Scripture ſpeak their Senſe as " plainly as the Bells ring what every Boy " would have them — At this rate we may " find the Alcoran in the Bible, as well as " make ſo many Books ſo different and con- " trary to each other, from the various " Compoſition of twenty four Letters — All " the Myſtery of thoſe Men conſiſts in

" wreſt-

" wreſting Metaphorical and Alluſive Ex-
" preſſions to a proper Senſe — He, who
" would be an honeſt Reader of Books,
" who hath no mind to turn every thing
" into Burleſque, ought carefully to diſtin-
" guiſh between Proper and Alluſive, or
" Metaphorical Expreſſions, to conſider
" the uſe of Words and Phraſes, and the
" great variety of Dialects, and the pecu-
" liar ways of ſpeaking in every Language,
" and in every Age, and to uſe Metaphors
" no farther than their firſt Intention, with-
" out which we may deal by all Authors, as
" theſe Men deal by Scripture, make them
" ſpeak Non-ſenſe, or (as they uſe to call
" them) *venerable Myſteries*, and overthrow
" and contradict their own Deſign. Thus,
Sir, by wreſting to a proper Senſe, the Al-
luſion which St. *John* makes to the firſt
Chapter of *Geneſis*, they have found a great
Myſtery in meer Metaphorical Expreſſions,
and the old Creation where the new is only
intended. This ſhort, but right and impor-
tant Conſequence, ought to indemnify me
for the trouble which the reading of ſo long
a Citation may have given you.

I know the Doctor in his *Vindication of the Trinity*, inveighs againſt the Hereticks who deſtroy Myſteries, and, as he thinks, do the Perſon of our Saviour a great Injury (as if Chriſtianity were undone, unleſs Chriſt be the Supream God.) But he has been formerly ſubject to the ſame Reproaches, without being much moved with them. We may therefore eaſily vindicate our ſelves with his own words, and ſay, " That Chriſt has
" occaſioned very great Miſtakes in ſome
" Mens Divinity, who are very zealous to
" advance Chriſt's Perſon, to the Prejudice
" and Reproach of his Religion. The
" Foundation of their Riddles and Myſte-
" ries, is, that they make the Perſon of
" Chriſt almoſt the ſole Object of the
" Chriſtian Religion (*Ib.* p. 10.) Thoſe
" Men who talk ſo much of the Perſon and
" Perſonal Excellencies of Chriſt, frequent-
" ly without any Senſe, and generally with-
" out any juſt ground from Reaſon or Scrip-
" ture, are very clamorous, and alarm the
" World with extream Jealouſies and Fears,
" as if there were a Party of Men ſtarted
" up, who deſign to make Chriſt uſeleſs,
" and to reduce Religion to its firſt natu-
" ral State, which knew no Prieſt, nor Sa-
" crifice, nor Mediator. It ſeems now that we have both the ſame Right with the Doctor, to believe that the Diſſenters are ill-grounded in expounding literally of the Perſon of Chriſt, what is only meant of his Doctrine in a Metaphorical way; and I do believe that the Doctor himſelf has no ground to take in a literal ſenſe for a ſecond Perſon in the Godhead, what is only metaphorically ſaid of that Perſon born of a Virgin, to whom the Father has imparted a Divine Power for the Work of the new Creation. One of the Diſſenters, againſt whom he diſputes, having ſaid, *Pag.* 138. That *as there is an Union of Three Perſons in One Nature in the Trinity, and of Two Natures in One Perſon in Chriſt, which is the Hypoſtatical Union; ſo the Myſtical Union is an Union of Perſons, where both Perſons and Natures are diſtinct*: the Doctor laughs at this Myſtical Union. How ſo? Is not the *Myſtical* Union of the Diſſenters as well grounded in Scripture, as the *Hypoſtatical* Union of Two Natures, or the *Eſſential* Union of the Three Perſons, which the Doctor thinks to be great Myſteries? And as for Reaſon, Is the word *Myſtical* more affrighting than the word *Hypoſtatical*? Alas! they are Brethren, let them joyn Hands and live peaceably in the Kingdom of Dreams.

This puts me in mind of a Reproach made unto us by a Papiſt, *viz.* That our Reformation has no certain Principle (*Conſider, upon the Schiſm of the Proteſt.*) *The Incomprehenſibility of a Myſtery*, ſays he, *is ſometimes look'd upon among them as a Demonſtration to condemn it; and ſometimes it is a Character of Divinity, which makes it adorable. Sometimes the Letter of the Scripture is a ſacred Authority which they cannot part with without committing a Sacrilege; and ſometimes they look upon it as a Letter which killeth.* Would to God this were an altogether ungrounded Reproach! We have no fixed Principle to

agree

agree about the Notion of a Myſtery, and it ſeems we are rather determin'd to our choice by *Caprichio* or Intereſt, than by the Scripture. What? taking wiſely the Scripture to be our Principle, have we adapted, for the expounding of it, this Maxim of Cardinal *Cuſanus*, *Secundum currentia tempora ſcripturas eſſe interpretandas, That the Scriptures ought to be interpreted according to the current of Times?* When we diſpute againſt the Diſſenters, we inveigh againſt Myſtery at the very firſt Page of the Book, thus, (*ubi ſupr.*) " It happens too often in Matters of Religion, " that Men conſider nothing but the ſound " of Words, and from thence form ſuch " uncough Ideas of Religion, as are fitted " to the meanneſs of the Underſtandings, or " gratify their Natural Genius or Diſpoſition, " or are calculated to ſerve an Intereſt. " And thus the Goſpel of our Saviour is " defaced and obſcured by affected Myſte- " ries, and Paradoxes, and ſenſeleſs Propo- " ſitions. And Chriſt himſelf, *who was the* " *Brightneſs of his Father's Glory, and the* " *expreſs Image of his Perſon*, who in the " moſt plain and perſpicuous manner de- " clared the Will of God to us, is repre- " ſented with a thicker Vail upon his Face " than *Moſes*. And the Glory of the ſecond " Covenant is much more obſcured with a " Miſt of Words, than the firſt was with " Types and Figures. *We add*, that to un- " riddle ſuch Myſteries, we muſt expect the " coming of *Elias*. But, what an Alter- ation is our Theology ſubject to, when we come to diſpute afterwards againſt the *Uni- tarians?* We mention *Myſtery* at the very Title of the Book, and we prejudice the Spirit of the Reader with it, *A Vindication of the Myſtery of the Holy Trinity*. Afterwards we ſpread over thoſe Doctrines a Cloud of Metaphyſical and Barbarous Terms. What ariſes from this? This Inconveni- ency, *viz.* " That (*ubi ſup.* p. 93.) ſuch Ar- " bitrary Notions do naturally force Men " to pervert the Scriptures to make them " ſpeak the Orthodox Language. To this " we owe all thoſe nice and ſubtile Diſtinc- " ons (*for Example, Self and Mutual Conſci-* " *ouſneſs*) which conſtitute the Body of Sy- " ſtematical Divinity, which commonly have " no other deſign than to elude the force of " Scripture, or to bribe it to ſpeak on their " ſide. Thus we our ſelves fall into that pi- riful Ridiculouſneſs, which he had formerly condemned. This we may call, To cry down Myſtery, till ſome other Intereſt will re- quire the contrary.

Now, Sir, if I was willing to go on fur- ther in this Conſideration, I ſhould only in- ſiſt upon all the Maxims made uſe of by Proteſtants againſt Tranſubſtantiation, and oppoſe them to their own Myſteries. They have none that may be able to bear the Trial of ſuch a Touch-ſtone. I ſhall only ſet down ſix of their Maxims, without making any particular Application of them, for that is out of my way. 1. *That Reaſon is the Fa- culty whereby Revelations are to be diſcerned.* 2. *That all ſupernatural Revelations do ſuppoſe the truth of the Principles of Natural Religion.* 3. *That all Reaſonings about Divine Revelations muſt neceſſarily be governed by the Principles of Natural Religion; that is, by thoſe Apprehenſi- ons which Men naturally have of the Divine Perfections.* 4. *That nothing ought to be re- ceived as a Revelation from God, which plainly contradicts the Principles of Natural Religion, or overthrows the Certainty of them.* 5. *That nothing ought to be received as a Divine Doctrine and Revelation, without good Evidence that it is ſo.* 6. *That no Argument is ſufficient to prove a Doctrine or Revelation to be from God, which is not clearer and ſtronger than the Difficulties and Objections againſt it.* Now either thoſe Maxims are falſe, and ill applied to Tranſub- ſtantiation; or, if there is any ſtrength in them againſt that pretended Myſtery, they overthrow at the ſame time all the Doctrines, which at this day go under that Name among Proteſtants. At leaſt I do not ſee how any rational Man can deny ſuch a Parity. They ſhould do me a kindneſs to ſhew me, that thoſe ſix Maxims do not hurt in the leaſt the Myſteries of the Trinity, and of the In- carnation.

Now, Sir, be pleaſed to hear ſome weak Reaſons alledged in the behalf of Myſtery.

It is objected, that there are Myſteries in Nature, and moſt incomprehenſible Truths; as for Example, The Union of our Soul with our Body; and conſequently, that we muſt not wonder, if there are ſome too in the Deity and Religion. And if thoſe, ſay they, though incomprehenſible, yet are moſt certain, Why ſhould we call into queſtion the latter? I anſwer, that there is a vaſt difference between both. Thoſe are only the Objects of our Curioſity, the ſearch whereof no body is bound to, ſeeing that Enquiry is rather a Raſhneſs, and an ill uſe of our Natural Light, which was given us in that reſpect only for the uſe of this Life both private and civil. But they will have theſe to be the Objects of our Faith and Religion, which ought to be the clearer and the more acceſſible to Reaſon, in that my Eternal Salvation is concerned in it, if I apprehend and embrace them; or my Eternal Miſery, if I reject or do not apprehend them. Will God have me to conceive the Union of my Soul with my Body under pain of Death, or promiſe of Life? No certainly; but he is willing that I ſhould have a right underſtanding of the Truths which I ought to believe, under the promiſe of Eternal Life, if I obey his Commands; and under the threatnings of Eternal Death, if I refuſe to acquieſce in them. And conſequently, he will have them to be proportionable to our Capacities: and indeed Religion ought to be clearer than thoſe Metaphyſical Objects. I confeſs that there are incomprehenſible things, which yet are true, but I deny that they are ſuch as do contradict our natural Ideas; I mean, thoſe clear and certain Notions, for want of which I ſhou'd not be capable of Religion; ſo that to be a Chriſtian, I ſhould ceaſe to be a Man.

They diſtinguiſh to no purpoſe, the manner of the Myſtery from the Myſtery it ſelf. This Diſtinction may hold in things which our Reaſon cannot apprehend, becauſe it has not in it ſelf the Ideas and the Proof thereof; as for Example, the manner of the Reſurrection. But it is falſe and wrongly applied to thoſe things which our Reaſon cannot apprehend, becauſe they contradict its moſt diſtinct and certain Ideas; as for Example, that three Divine Perſons are but one God. Then the manner of the Myſtery only is not to be called in queſtion, ſince the Myſtery in it ſelf, propounded with its greateſt Simplicity, is ſurrounded with Contradictions, which way ſoever it be viewed.

Moreover they will ſay, that the Myſtery lies only in the Objects of Religion, but that the way of revealing them is clear and eaſy. But if the Revelation is ſo clear, Why do Men contrive new Words unknown to Scripture, to explain it more clearly? Divines are very happy to have found out Expreſſions more fit to expreſs the Truths of God, than the Holy Ghoſt himſelf, who knows the deep things of God. And if the Objects are in themſelves ſo obſcure and unintelligible, why do they broach new Terms, to endeavour to make us underſtand that which is incomprehenſible? Beſides, how can a Book be accounted clear, which is eaſy to be underſtood in its Terms, but is altogether obſcure in the Objects which it contains? Holy Obſcurity! Lightſome Darkneſs! The Words made uſe of to explain the Things are very clear, but the Things explained by thoſe Words are very obſcure: And what is more admirable, though the Words be very clear, yet we perceive thrô that Light, that the Things are very obſcure; and though the Things be very obſcure, yet thrô that Obſcurity we perceive, that the Words are very clear. Thus they have found the way to reconcile Light with Darkneſs: This is a new kind of Oracles never heard of before. The Oracles of the falſe Gods contained things very intelligible in themſelves, but expreſſed with obſcure and equivocal Terms. On the contrary, thoſe of the true God contain Truths incomprehenſible and unintelligible in themſelves, but expreſſed with clear and eaſy Terms. At this rate the ancient Fathers could not fairly inveigh ſo much againſt the Ambiguity and the Riddles of the Heatheniſh Oracles.

But after all, how come they to know that the Things are obſcure, if the Words that teach

teach them are plain and eaſy? Or, how do they know that the Words are plain and eaſy, if the Things contained in them are obſcure? Clear and eaſy Words in unintelligible Things are meer Words without Senſe. And Things which are unintelligible, though expreſſed with plain and eaſy Words, are called a *Galimaufrey*. They pay a ſtrange Honour to Scripture, by aſcribing to it ſuch Myſteries and ſuch a Clearneſs. The Objects of that Book remaining ſtill in the dark, the Book muſt needs be dark too, though the Words be never ſo clear. On the contrary, if I was to commend the Clearneſs of Scripture, without baniſhing that holy Obſcurity which the Orthodox are ſo well pleaſed with, I would ſay that though moſt of its Terms be obſcure and unuſual in other Languages and other Books, yet the Things are ſo clear in it, at leaſt as far as they are to be believed in order to Salvation, that the Evidence of thoſe Objects mentioned in ſo many places, and grounded upon ſenſible Facts, takes off the Obſcurity of certain Expreſſions which in themſelves are very dark, becauſe they paſs from a Profane to a Divine Uſe, which is leſs natural to them. But this is not the right way to find Myſteries, and Men are reſolved at any rate to have ſome covered with a dreadful and ſacred Horror.

The Author of *the Hiſtory of Oracles* has prettily ſaid, *that he who has never ſo little ſtudied the Spirit of Man, knows what an Impreſſion wonderful Things make upon it.* In- " deed, *Plato*, who is all over ſublime and " wonderful, became thereby a Philoſopher " in faſhion among the learned Chriſtians of " the firſt Ages, and the Agreeableneſs which " they thought to perceive between his " Philoſophy and the Religion of Chriſt, " cauſed them to look upon him as a kind " of a Propher, who had found out ſeveral " important Matters of Chriſtianity, eſpeci- " ally the Trinity, which cannot be denied " to be clearly contained in his Writings. " Bewitched with ſuch a monſtrous Preju- " dice, we look upon his Works, as ſo many " Commentaries upon Scripture, and fan- " cy that the nature of the Word was ſuch " as he fancied it to be. The Ancient firſt " of all lay hold of this ſeeming Conformi- " ty, the Modern have followed them. " Whatever was ſpoken by the Ancient, ei- " ther good or bad, is obnoxious to frequent " Repetitions; and what they were not able " to make good themſelves by ſufficient " Reaſons, is now proved by their ſole Au- " thority. If they foreſaw this, it was well " to ſpare themſelves the labour of an exact " Reaſoning. Thoſe Prejudices being brought " into Religion, found the way as it " were to be confounded with it, and to get " a Veneration which is due to it only. This Author clearly enough diſcovers to us the Source of Myſtery ſpringing out of the wonderful and incomprehenſible Language of *Plato*, and at the ſame time the holy Reverence paid to Myſteries ariſing from a blind Reſpect paid to a falſe Antiquity. I add, that that which makes Myſtery the more commendable, is the need Men ſtand in thereof to hide their Errors; for this is the laſt Hold whither they repair, when they are at a loſs, and have nothing to ſay in their own defence. *Myſtery* is a Supplement ready at hand, when we fall ſhort of Reaſon. In a word, *Myſtery* is a Salve for all Diſeaſes. It dazles the Eyes of ſimple Men, or rather bewitches them in ſo great a meaſure, that by ſeeing they perceive not the Ridiculouſneſs of the Opinions impoſed upon their Belief, and it makes wiſe Men willingly to ſhut them; for they do not love to be diſturbed in the Enjoyment of their Temporal Advantages, and are afraid of *Socrates* his Fate.

In the mean time I hope, Sir, we ſhall no more be troubled with this dreadful Word, and *Myſtery* will be no longer in faſhion, ſince Dr. *Sherlock* has ſo clearly and eaſily explained to us the Trinity, and a Papiſt a Friend of his who has well ſtudied his Syſtem, has happily made uſe of it to uncover the whole Secret of Tranſubſtantiation. *Self* and *Mutual-Conſciouſneſs* are one of thoſe Keys fit to open any Door, and which lays the Senſe of the moſt abſtruſe Opinions ſo open to us, that thoſe who after his opening, ſhall

be

be ſo bold as to call them Myſteries ſtill, muſt be accounted very mean Divines, not to ſay Hereticks. I hope further, that when we ſhall ask Evidence and Reaſon in matters of Faith, they will no more cry out that it is to run down Myſteries, to form a plain and eaſy Religion. For at this rate the Doctor himſelf ſhould be a great Deſtroyer of Myſteries, ſince he has made the Trinity (if we muſt believe him upon his word) a plain and eaſy Truth, free from Contradiction, and agreeable to Reaſon. Is not the Reaſonableneſs of this Demand, and the Pretentions of Hereticks, juſtified by the many Endeavours that are uſed, to take off the Difficulties of this Myſtery, and to make it parallel with the moſt common Doctrines, which are neither wonderful, nor incomprehenſible? I perceive what this is. The Name of *Myſtery* is only a *proviſionary* Title beſtowed upon the Trinity, till ſome other Syſtem be found out, whereby it may be made clearer and more agreeable to Reaſon. It may be the Doctor is that bleſſed Chriſtian, to whom Heaven had reſerved the Diſcovery thereof. If it be ſo, the Hereticks will be convinced of Error, but at leaſt they ſhall enjoy the pleaſure of ſeeing Myſtery falling down, and of being ſatisfied about the Evidence and the Reaſonableneſs which they ask.

Beſides, the Papiſts will be able at the ſame time to ſhew us the poſſibility of Tranſubſtantiation. Or, if we will lay aſide the Papiſts, we may make uſe of the Hypotheſis of the *Ubiquitarians* or *Lutherans*, who are our Brethren, and apply the Doctor's Philoſophy thereunto. They will eaſily ſhew us, that it implies no Contradiction. For the eternal Word of God being preſent every where, the Body which he aſſumed to himſelf by Perſonal Union, is preſent every where; not that it is divided and ſeparated by infinite Parts, but becauſe it is united to an Infinite Mind. And tho we ſhould ſuppoſe as many ſacred *Hoſts* as there are Altars in the World, yet there is but one Body of Chriſt; thoſe ſacred Hoſts being numerically One by reaſon of their *Mutual Senſation* with one another, and with the Original Body of Chriſt, which is in Heaven. " But that this may
" not be thought a meer Arbi- *Vindic. of*
" trary and groundleſs Con- *the Myſt. of*
" jecture, I ſhall ſhew you that *of the Holy*
" this is the true Scripture-No- *Trin.* p. 50.
" tion of *the Plurality of Sacra-*
" *mental Bodies in one Natural Body.* When Chriſt delivered the Bread to his Diſciples, he told them, *This is my Body*; not my *Bodies*, but my *Body*: as for Example, he told *Peter*, *This is my Body*; he told *James*, *This is my Body*; he told *John*, *This is my Body*; yet there are not three Bodies, but one Body. (*Ib.* p. 82.) " *Each Hoſt is the Body of Chriſt*,
" for each Hoſt hath the whole and entire
" Operations *of the Body*, having by this
" Mutual *Senſation* the other *Hoſts* in it ſelf;
" ſo that each *Hoſt* is in ſome ſenſe the whole
" *Plurality of the Hoſts* by their In-being
" and In-dwelling *The Body delivered to*
" *James* is in *the Body delivered to* Peter;
" and the *Body delivered to* Peter is in the
" *Body delivered to* James; and the *Body*
" *delivered to* John is in the *Bodies delivered*
" *to* Peter *and* James; and the *Bodies delivered*
" *to* Peter *and* James are in the *Body delive-*
" *red to* John; and therefore if that Trini-
" ty of *Hoſts delivered to* Peter *and* James
" *and* John be the *Body*, the *Hoſt of* Peter
" *is the Body*, the *Hoſt of* James *is the Body*,
" the *Hoſt of* John *is the Body*, they being
" all mutually in each other; and yet this
" is a plain Demonſtration that they are not
" three *Bodies*, but one *Body*, becauſe nei-
" ther of them is the one *Eſſential Body*, but
" as thus intimately united to all the reſt,
" and then they can be all three but one
" *Eſſential Body*. Natural Reaſon teaches
" nothing about the *Sacramentality* of the
" *Body-head*; it teaches one *Body*, but whe-
" ther this one *Body* be one or *many Sacra-*
" *mental Bodies*, it ſays not. And therefore
" it may be either without contradicting
" the Natural Notions we have of one *Body*.
" And then there is free ſcope for Revela-
" tion: And if Revelation teaches that there
" is but one *Eſſential Body*, and that there

" are

" are *many Sacramental Bodies*, each of which " in Scripture have not only the Title, but " the Nature and Attributes of the *Body* a- " ſcribed to them, then we muſt of neceſſi- " ty believe *a Plurality* in Unity, *many Sa- " cramental Bodies* in one *Eſſential Body*. For " what the Scripture affirms, and Reaſon " does not deny, is a proper Object of our " Faith. And then the Objection againſt " this Faith, that theſe *many Sacramental* " *Bodies* muſt be *many* diſtinct *Bodies*, if " each of them is the *Body*, is ſenſeleſs and " ridiculous. For it is demonſtrable, that " if there be *many Sacramental Bodies*, and " one *Eſſential Body*, each *Sacramental Body* " muſt be the *Body*; and yet there cannot " be *many* diſtinct *Bodies*, but one *Body*. For " if each *Sacramental Body* be not the *Body*, " all cannot be the *Body*, unleſs the *Body-head* " have *Sacramental and Perſonal Bodies* in it, " which are not the *Body*; and if all are but " one *Eſſential Body*, they cannot be *many* " diſtinct *Bodies*. So that all the Abſurdi- " ties and Contradictions are vaniſhed only " into *Nicodemus* his Queſtion, *How can theſe* " *things be?* The right Anſwer is, God " knows. Muſt we deny things that we " cannot conceive and comprehend, though " it be expreſly taught by God himſelf? " Muſt we deny what we read in the Bible " to be there, becauſe Reaſon does not teach " it, and cannot frame an Adequate Idea " of it? (*ib.* p. 180.) If you ſay that the " *Sacramental Bodies* are not the one *Eſſential* " *Body*, as the *Original Body which is in Hea-* " *ven*, is. I anſwer, That neither the *Origi-* " *nal Body*, nor the *Sacramental and Begotten* " *Bodies* conſidered ſeparately from each " other, are the one *Eſſential Body*; they be- " ing only *Perſonal Bodies*, both the *Original* " *and Sacramental Ones*; but the *Original* " *and begotten Bodies* conſidered as united to " each other by Mutual Conſciouſneſs, is the " one *Eſſential Body*.

Thus, Sir, an *Ubiquitarian* will prove the Poſſibility of his Myſtery by Dr. *Sherlock*'s Philoſophy. But it may be Dr. *Wallis* is the Man moſt fit to demonſtrate this Poſſibility, and that it is better proved from *Mathe-* *matical Ideas* than *Plato*'s. Let us ſuppoſe further that it is ſo; an Ubiquitarian will not diſlike this neither. For if the Doctor can rightly make uſe of the *three Dimenſions of Matter* to take away the Contradictions which ſeem to be contained in the Trinity, why ſhall not an Ubiquitarian be allowed to make uſe of the Idea of the *Diviſibility of Matter to Infinity*, to reſolve the Objections that are made againſt him about the *Diviſibility* and the *Ubiquity* of Chriſt's Body upon many Altars at the ſame time? He may anſwer, that, as a *Cube* may be divided *in infinitum*, and yet the Matter divided loſes none of its Dimenſions, every part having ſtill the Eſſential Properties of Matter, the Length, the Breadth, and the Thickneſs. Thus the *Original Body* of Chriſt may be multiplied into a Million of other *Sacramental and Perſonal Bodies*, without loſing any of its Eſſential Properties, not even its Unity: There being no Contradiction that a Body *Hypoſtatically* united to an Infinite Spirit, ſhould be where-ever that Spirit is; or that a Body, to which the Bread is *Hypoſtatically* united, ſhould be with reſpect to the Subſtance where-ever the Bread is. So that though there be but *one Chriſt*, yet there are *many* Bodies, and thoſe many Bodies are *unum, non unus*.

" * Theſe many, who are one " *what*, or many *ſomewhats*, " are but one *Chriſt*. For theſe

* Dr. Wall. third Let.

" *ſomewhats* are called *Bodies* in a *Metaphori-* " *cal* manner, whereby we mean no more, " but ſomewhat analogous thereunto: And " which (becauſe of ſuch Analogy) we " ſo call, as knowing no better words to " uſe inſtead thereof. And therefore there " is but one Chriſt, though there may be " many Sacramental and Perſonal Bodies, " becauſe the ſame Chriſt may be ſaid to " ſuſtain divers Perſons, and thoſe Perſons " to be the ſame Chriſt, that is the ſame " Chriſt as ſuſtaining divers *Capacities*, *Per-* " *ſonalities*, *Sacramentalities*, *Corporalities*; " as is ſaid of *Tully*, *Ego ſolus tres Perſonas* " *ſuſtineo, meam, adverſarii, & Judicis.* And

" all People, that can tell Money, know that " *twelve Pence* are but *one Shilling*; every " *Baker that can make Bread knows that many* " *Grains of Corn make but one Loaf*, and what " in one Conſideration is many, may in " another Conſideration be but one. So true it is, that with never ſo little Philoſophy, and by the means of a Compariſon of *three Groats and one Shilling*, the meaneſt Plow-man may ſee clearly into the darkeſt Myſteries. But, alas! we are Chriſtians, and yet we expound Revelation by the Principles which Philoſophy affords us; and we endeavour to find in it ſuch things as may ſupport our Prejudices, without examining whether the Sacred Writers were Philoſophers; or, ſuppoſe they were, whether they followed *Carteſius*, *Ariſtotle*, or *Plato*'s Ideas; or, whether they were Mathematicians. Muſt all our Diſputes, even the moſt material, depend only upon meer Metaphyſicks, and that by running our ſelves into Myſteries, we fall into ſuch a Confuſion of Words, and incomprehenſible Notions, whereby that Divine Light, which ought to enlighten the moſt ſimple Men, is altogether darkned? No, the Holy Ghoſt's Intent was not to make us Philoſophers, he always accommodates himſelf to our moſt common Ideas, and the Expreſſions of Scripture, which ſeem to have occaſioned the Notion of a Myſtery, are only Figures, and Expreſſions common either to our Stile, or the time wherein it was written. The only ſight of its uſefulneſs and ſcope will convince us of its Simplicity and Clearneſs.

1. It was given us to excite and preſerve among Men the Natural Principles of Morality and Religion, which Nature or the Univerſal Tradition has ingrafted in their Hearts. And how could it confirm to us the Truth of thoſe Natural Notions, and even ſtrengthen them by a new Light, if the firſt Duty which it impoſes upon us, did conſiſt in calling into Queſtion our cleareſt Notions, and our moſt certain Principles? For Example, When I hear Men talk of a God, or of one ſole God, I have a Natural Idea of thoſe two words, *One* and *God*, and this Idea is common both to me and all Men, who are come to the knowledg of one God. Shall we believe that Scripture ſpeaks a new Language, that it may not be underſtood, when it ſpeaks of one ſole God, and that it requires from me a confuſed and uncertain Faith, which is only grounded upon ſo ſubtile and ſlippery Ideas, as the quickeſt Imagination cannot retain? The Name of God can be aſcribed to none but in a proper or figurative way (for as to the Metaphyſical and Myſterious Senſe, it is neither the Language of God, nor of Angels, nor of Men, as ſuch, I mean, as they have not corrupted their Mind by an unnatural Study.) In a proper Senſe the Supream Being goes under that Name by reaſon of its Nature: In a figurative Senſe Chriſt has this Name beſtowed upon him by reaſon of his Power and Authority. Thoſe two Senſes are ſo clear and ſo often reiterated in Scripture, and at the ſame time ſo agreeable with our Notions, that one muſt have only his Eyes and a New Teſtament to be convinced thereof.

2. Revelation was given us to abridge our Studies and Enquiries, by making eaſy to us the knowledg of our Happineſs, and the means whereby we may be fitted to attain to it. I confeſs Philoſophers might have clearer Notions about this Point than ſimple Men, if we muſt come to it by long Reaſonings: But ſince Revelation made thoſe Truths common to thoſe who cannot reach to an exact Reaſoning, the meaneſt Men have as much knowledg about this matter, as the moſt learned can have. For Example, One might know by Nature and Reaſoning, the Juſtice, the Goodneſs, and the Power of God in rewarding juſt Men: One might alſo from God's general Promiſes infer by ſeveral Conſequences the particular Reward of the Reſurrection of the Dead. Thus *Abraham* by Reaſoning concluded that God might raiſe his Son from

from the Dead, whereof yet he had no formal and particular Promiſe (Λογιζόμενος, *ratiocinatus eſt*, Heb. 11. 19.) Thus alſo our Saviour argues againſt the *Sadducees* about that general Promiſe, *I am the God of* Abraham, *&c.* from whence he infers the Reſurrection of thoſe Patriarchs. But now adays we have ſo clear and ſo expreſs a Revelation about the Truths of our Salvation, that the moſt ſimple Men can apprehend them without reaſoning, ſo far are they from ſtanding in need of flying to Philoſophical and Speculative Diſtinctions. In this new Covenant which God has contracted with the Houſe of *Jacob* according to the Promiſe of *Jeremiah*, no body needs to enquire from his Brother, his Neighbour, *&c.* after what manner the Lord ought to be known and worſhipped; for *we are all taught of God*, who has put his Word *nigh us*, &c. *i. e.* it is ſo agreeable to our Capacities, that to know *the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom he has ſent (which is our Eternal Life)* we need to conſult neither the *School-men*, nor Dr. *Sherlock*, nor Dr. *Wallis*'s Notions, nor the Diſtinction of *Eſſence* and *Perſons*, or of *Self* and *Mutual-Conſciouſneſs*, or of the *three Capacities* with reſpect to *three Dimenſions* of a *Cube*. We have no more to do, than to open the Goſpel, to frame a diſtinct Faith of *one ſole God the Father, Maker of Heaven and Earth*, who *ſent his Son to us*, and of *one Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, whom the Father has *highly exalted, by giving him a Name which is above every Name*, &c.

God, who will have all Men to be ſaved, and to come to the knowledg of his Truths, has made his Revelation ſo intelligible, as to make it plain and eaſy to all Men, as well to Idiots, as to the moſt ſubtile Philoſophers. Therefore it is, God never uſes any Term to teach us his Myſteries, but what we have a clear and diſtinct Idea of. All that he requires from us is, that we ſhould ſpiritualize thoſe Notions, when the Terms made uſe of by him are taken from Earthly Things; or that we ſhould ſuit our Notions to the Nature of the Objects which he ſpeaks of, when the words uſed by him are borrowed from a kind of things more ſublime and excellent. In the firſt reſpect he makes uſe of the Terms, *Water, Bread, Light*, &c. to repreſent his Doctrine; Terms whereof we have a clear Notion in the ſenſe of *waſhing*, of *nouriſhing*, and of *enlightening*, wherein they are uſed. And that firſt Notion, though it be groſs, yet if it be diſtinct, is like the Foundation of the other Spiritual Notion, which God lays upon it. In the ſecond reſpect, the Scripture aſcribes the Name of *God* to Kings, Angels, and the *Meſſias*, calls us the *Sons of God*, ſays that we are *Partakers of the Divine Nature*, &c. Terms whereof we may have a moſt clear Idea, in the ſenſe of *Power*, of *Holineſs*, and of *Immortality*, wherein they are uſed; ſo we fit that Idea, which is borrowed from an Infinite Nature, to the Nature of Finite Objects, whereunto it is applied. As to Metaphyſical Terms of *Eſſence, Perſonality*, and *Conſubſtantiality*, the Scripture hath not liked to make uſe of them, becauſe they have not a fixed ſenſe, and are not univerſally underſtood. And as we have no Natural Notions of them, they are not able to raiſe us from our Earthly Conceptions, to a Divine and Spiritual Knowledg, nor to bring us from the Idea of God's Perfections, to the Idea of the Vertues, which he imparts to his moſt excellent Creatures.

However, Sir, though that Philoſophical Gibberiſh be never ſo trifling, yet it made long ago the Language of Scripture uſeleſs, under pretence of giving a fuller ſenſe of our Myſteries. But if the Lovers of Myſteries pretend, that what they call Faith, ought to deſtroy Reaſon, and our Natural Notions: I cannot ſee why the Perſecutors may not pretend, that what they call Zeal, ought to take off Natural Pity? Thus, on one hand, falſe Zeal; and on the other, Myſterious Abſurdities, ſhall utterly extinguiſh the Light of the Mind, and the Tender-

neſs

neſs of Nature; ſo that at laſt we may prove to be without Scripture and Conſcience, unleſs God prevents us in his Mercy; and under the Name of Chriſtians, we ſhall ceaſe to be Men, and be like Beaſts without Underſtanding and Compaſſion. *May God Almighty, who is rich in Mercies, preſerve unto us his ſimple Truth, which ſhall make us free from Error and Sin!*

I am, Sir,

Your moſt obliged Servant.

FINIS.

Doctor Wallis's

LETTER

Touching the

DOCTRINE

OF THE

Blessed Trinity

Answer'd by his FRIEND.

Honoured SIR,

I Read your Letter touching the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, you were pleas'd to send me, with a great deal of Attention and Satisfaction; and thereupon went to visit a Neighbour of mine, one that is reputed a modest Gentleman, but one that is also reputed an *Unitarian* or *Socinian*. I shew'd him your Letter, and made no question, but it would Convince him, as it had done me, that they who denied the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, Three distinct Persons to be

each of them God in the moſt perfect Senſe of that Term, and yet but One God, were in a very dangerous and palpable Errour. But I found my ſelf greatly miſtaken; for he preſently told me, that you had unfairly repreſented them, charging them with an Opinion which they abhor, to wit, That *how clear ſoever the Expreſſions of Scripture be, or can be, to* this purpoſe, *they will not believe it, as being inconſiſtent with Natural Reaſon. And therefore though they do not think fit to give us a bare-fac'd Rejection of Scripture, yet they do* (*and muſt they tell us*) *put ſuch a forc'd Senſe on the words of it* (*be they never ſo plain*) *as to make them ſignifie ſomewhat elſe.*

He told me he did very much wonder, and was ſorry for your ſake, that a Man of ſuch Reputation for Learning and Piety, ſhould be guilty of ſo much uncharitable raſhneſs againſt a Party of Men, which even ſome of their Adverſaries being Judges, are both Learned and Pious, though Erroneous. If it were not their hearty Zeal for one of the great and clear Attributes of God (the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus) his Unity; What (ſaith he to me, with a moſt compaſſionate Concern) ſhould make them expoſe themſelves to all manner of Obloquy, Reproach, and Deteſtation of almoſt all that go under the Name of Chriſtians, in theſe Parts, to the utmoſt of Injuries and Perſecutions, the loſs of their Imployments, Eſtates, Liberties, Countries, and ſome of them of Life it ſelf, by the violent Death of Hereticks? Neither do they this from an Enthuſiaſtic Heat, nor yet upon the account of ſome indifferent, or next to indifferent things in the Worſhip and Diſcipline of the Church; it's no leſs than the Incommunicable Nature of the *only Potentate*, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, that they ſuffer for; hoping for their Reward through the Faith of thoſe Promiſes revealed by Chriſt our Lord, and recorded only in the Holy Scriptures. The Authority whereof none have maintained with ſtronger Reaſonings, nor are more diligent in ſearching out the true Senſe of them, nor are more ready to ſubmit to their Dictates. He ſaid moreover, That it was too common, for even Learned Men to charge the *Unitarians*, under the Name of *Socinians*, with ſuch Sayings as their Adverſaries charge them with by Conſequences, without reading their Books. Nay, it is well known at *Oxford*, that one in an Act there, diſputing for his Degree in Divinity, took a *Theſis* to maintain, to the very ſame purpoſe with that which your Friend avers againſt the *Socinians*, but his Learned Opponent having read their Books, did ſo baffle him, that it appeared the Reſpondent had not read them; but took his Teſtimonies from their Adverſaries. I would fain think otherwiſe of Dr. *Wallis*; but he gives me here too much cauſe to ſuſpect him; I will appeal to you (ſaith he) whether he does not.

Then he fetch'd me *Socinus de Authoritate S. Script.* and read in pag. 16. *Quod enim ad Rationes attinet, hæc nimis fallax via eſt in re quæ ex Divina pateſactione pendeat, qualis eſt Chriſtiana Religio.* "For as to Rea-
" ſons, this is too fallible a way in a
" Matter which depends on Divine
" Revelations, ſuch as Chriſtian Reli-
" gion is. Next he brought *Sclichtingius*, another eminent Writer that followed

followed *Socinus*; He in his Book *Adv. Mtiſn. de SS. Trin. p.* 68. His Adverſary had ſaid, That Holy Scripture only is the moſt perfect Rule of Faith and Life. To which *Selichtingius* anſwers "That if *de re-*
" *bus, clariſſimis verbis in Scriptura*
" *conſignatis*, &c. it be touching Points
" expreſt in Scripture in moſt clear
" words, ſo that no Man of a ſound
" Mind can doubt of the Senſe of
" them, then he grants it; and that
" chiefly, becauſe it is moſt certain,
" That *the Scripture contains nothing*
" *that is repugnant to manifeſt Reaſon*,
" or that implies a real Contradicti-
" on: But if it treat of obſcure Mat-
" ters, every one ſees that it can-
" not be determin'd without Reaſon,
" which yet is not to be ſetch'd in, as
" if it could be oppoſed to Scripture,
" affirming or denying any thing, but
" only to declare, whether ſuch a
" thing be contained in Scripture, or
" not? If it appear to be contain'd
" in it, whatſoever Reaſon may ſtill
" ſay in Contradiction, it muſt of ne-
" ceſſity be deceived. This, ſays my Gentleman, is a clear Account of the *Socinians* Judgment in this Point, and is a direct Confutation of what you have read me out of your Doctor's Letter. He added yet another of their great Men, *Smalcius contr. Frant. Diſp.* 4. *p.* 137. " *Nulla enim eſt Chri-*
" *ſtianæ Religionis particula*, &c. There
" is not the leaſt part of Chriſtian
" Religion, which doth not accord
" with Reaſon, and that Opinion,
" which doth not agree with Reaſon,
" can have no place in Divinity. As
" a ſmall Light to a great one, ſo Rea-
" ſon is not contrary to Holy Scrip-
" ture. Let *Frantzius*, or any body
" elſe, tells us of any one Sentence of
" Holy Scripture that is repugnant to
" Reaſon, and then let Reaſon be ſi-
" lent in the Church. Religion and
" Holy Scripture hath many things
" above Reaſon, and therein it highly
" commends it ſelf, but nothing which
" is contrary to Reaſon. Of theſe two laſt Paſſages the learned and candid Dr. *Tillotſon* takes notice (in his Book *The Difference betwixt the Proteſtant and Socinian Methods*) in Abatement of his Charge againſt ſome *Socinians* for exalting Reaſon too much. *Perhaps* (ſaith he) *your Friend, Dr.* Wallis, *had read that Book, but took no notice of the Quotations in the Margin.* And if he were put to't, to maintain his Charge, *viz. That they do* (*and muſt, they tell us*) *put ſuch a forced Senſe on the words of it* [*the Scripture*] (*be they never ſo plain*) *as to make them ſignify ſomewhat elſe:* I am perſwaded he would acquit himſelf no better than the Candidate in Divinity I told you of.

He was much concerned at the Injuriouſneſs of this Imputation; and ſaid, He thought there was no ſort of Proteſtants, of different Sentiments from the Publick, that were ſo inhumanly dealt with as the *Unitarians*; for they are ſo far from denying there are Three Perſons in One God, and aſſerting only One, in oppoſition to the plaineſt Scriptures, that they are thorowly perſwaded, the whole Scripture, wherever it is plain, is on their ſide. For does not every Text in the whole Bible, that ſpeaks clearly of the moſt High God, ſpeak of him as One ſingle Perſon, except only two or three obſcure Paſſages in *Geneſis?* Neither can we have any Idea or Conception of God, but *Perſon* is included in it, taking Perſon for an intelligent Being; ſo that all plain and clear Scriptures militate for them;

and the *Trinitarians*, or thoſe that ſay there are Three Perſons in God, or that *Three Perſons are all one God*, as your Doctor ſays, have no Scriptures left, but thoſe that are obſcure. And that they are obſcure, appears clearly by this; That there is ſcarce one Text alledged, by them, which is not otherwiſe expounded, and in conſiſtency with the Unity of the Perſon of God by their Writers. You may ſee a great number of theſe Texts and Expoſitions, in a Book enticuled, *Scriptura S. Trin. Revelatrix, under the Name of* Cingallus.

Your Doctor (proceeds he) names but two Texts, for he takes his Opinion for granted, as ſufficiently proved by others. His firſt Text is, 1 *John* 5. 7. *There are Three that bear Witneſs in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt, and theſe Three are One.* One would expect now that the Learned Doctor, naming but two Texts, ſhould cull out thoſe that were ſtrongeſt for his purpoſe; and yet this Text is ſo far from being clear and ſtrong, That, 1. it has not the Authority as other Scriptures have; for it appears not in the moſt ancient Copies of the *Greek*, nor in the *Syriack*, nor *Arabick*, nor *Ethiopick*, nor *Armenian Biblts*, nor in the moſt eminent *Latin Biblts*. 'Tis not urged by the Fathers in their Diſputes about this Queſtion. It's wholly rejected by ſome, and counted doubtful by almoſt all Learned Men. You may ſee (ſaith he) in Dr. *Burnet*, Biſhop of *Salisbury*, his ſecond Letter in his Travels, how variouſly and uncertainly that Text appears in Ancient Manuſcripts. Here my Neighbour crav'd my Pardon, went to his Cloſet, and preſently brought me a Greek Teſtament, printed at *Strasburg* by *Wolfius Cephalæus*, *Anno* 1524. in the beginning of the Reformation, wherein this Verſe is wanting. But, 2*ly*, allowing it to be Authentick, yet the moſt Learned, even of the *Trinitarians*, underſtand it not thus, *Theſe Three are One God*, but *Theſe Three are One in Teſtimony*, or agree in Teſtimony. See *Beza*, *Vatablus*, *Calvin*, *Eraſmus*, the Engliſh *Geneva* Notes. As for his other Text, *Matth.* 28. 19. I refer you to *The Brief Hiſtory of the Unitarians*, &c. *in four Letters*, whereof he gave me a Copy. Only I deſire you (ſays he) to conſider how clear a Proof this Text is, which muſt run thus: *We are Baptized in* [or *into*] *the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*; *Therefore theſe Three Perſons are One God, and each of them by himſelf God.* As if the *Iſraelites*, by being Baptized into *Moſes*, and believing in the Lord, and in *Moſes* his Servant, (ſo Marg. *Exod.* 14. 31.) did acknowledg *Moſes* to be a Perſon of the moſt high God, though he was indeed, in ſome ſenſe, a *God* to them; for he was ſo to *Aaron* their High Prieſt: for thus it is read in the Margin of the Engliſh Bible, printed in 1660. *He ſhall be to thee a Mouth, and thou ſhalt be to him a God*, Exod. 4. 16. You may ſee the *Hebrew* ſo render'd, *Jer.* 31. 33. and the *Greek*, Heb. 8. 10.

I muſt confeſs to you, Sir, I could not tell what to oppoſe to this Argument of his, which ſhew'd the obſcurity of our Texts; and he now made a Pauſe, and expected my Anſwer: Wherefore to divert him from taking notice of my Convictions, I aſked him if he had any other Argument to prove that Obſcurity? He anſwered,

ſwered, Yes: And that alſo is taken (ſaith he) from our Adverſaries the *Trinitarians*, I mean, the *Romaniſts*: For they are told by Mr. *Chillingworth*, (the Glory of Engliſh Proteſtants) and ſince that by Dr. *Tennifon*, in his words, thus: "For Scrip-"ture, your Men deny very plainly "and frequently, that this Doctrine of "the Trinity, can be proved by it. "See, if you pleaſe, this plainly taught, "and urged very earneſtly by Cardi-"nal *Hoſius de Author. S. Script. l.* 3. "*p.* 53. by *Gordonius Huntlæus contr.* "*Tom.* 1. *Controv.* 1. *de Verbo Dei*, "*c.* 19. by *Gretſerus* and *Tannerus* in "*Colloquio Ratiſbon*; and alſo by *Vega*, "*Poſſevin*, *Wiekus*, and others. Now it is to be obſerved, That theſe Learned Men, eſpecially *Bellarmine*, and *Wiekus* after him, have urged all the Scriptures they could, with their utmoſt induſtry, find out in this Cauſe, and yet, after all, they acknowledg their Inſufficiency and Obſcurity; whereby they give a clear Teſtimony to the Doctrine of God's being One Perſon; which to deny, were even to deny the whole Bible.

But beſides the current of all Scriptures on our ſide, we have many clear Texts that prove the Father only to be God. I'll name but two: Our Lord himſelf profeſſes in his ſolemn Prayer to his Father, in the preſence of his Diſciples, ſaying, *This is Eternal Life, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent*, John 17. 3. And the Apoſtle St. *Paul* ſays, in oppoſition to Gods many, and Lords many, *But to us there is but One God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we by him*, 1 Cor. 8. 6. Can any words be more expreſs to prove that there is but One true God, and One Perſon of that One God, to wit, the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who is oppos'd to him by his Names, Relations, and Characters? Again, there be a multitude of Texts that deny thoſe things of Chriſt, which cannot be denied of God; and that affirm ſuch things of him that cannot agree to him, if he were a Perſon of God. In like manner of the Holy Ghoſt. Which of both ſorts you may find urg'd and defended in the two Books of *John Crellius*, touching One God the Father; and abridg'd in *Wolzogenius*'s *Præparatio ad utilem Lectionem Lib. N. T. cap.* 2, 3, 4, 5. So alſo in your *Brief Hiſtory, &c.* the firſt Letter.

I then deſired to know of the Gentleman, what he could ſay to the Tradition of the Chriſtian Church; for you ſay, that That *from the Time of Chriſt and his Apoſtles hitherto, as well before as ſince, the Council of* Nice *hath ever held the Divinity of theſe three Perſons, and that theſe Three are but One God.* This alſo you take for granted. He anſwered, 1. It is the Catholick Principle of all Proteſtants, that the Holy Scriptures are a compleat Rule of Faith and Manners, and clear and plain in all things neceſſary. Now ſince this Doctrine of the Three Perſons in One God, is held a Fundamental and Neceſſary Doctrine, it muſt conſequently be clear and plain to all honeſt Enquirers, which I clearly ſee it is not, therefore I can ſatisfy my ſelf concerning it, without an endleſs Enquiry into the Fathers and Tradition.

2. I am ſure it has not been held

in

in the Apoſtles Time, nor, I believe, in any of the Three firſt Centuries, nor even in the Three next, without much oppoſition.

3. I think that *Curcellæus* has proved, as well as any thing can be proved out of Ancient Writings, That the Doctrine of the Trinity, about the Time of the Council of *Nice*, was of a ſpecial Union of Three Perſons in the Deity, and not of a numerical, as it is now taught, and has been taught ſince the Chimerical Schoolmen were hearkned unto.

4. I wonder how Dr. *Wallis* reckons the Chriſtian Church, ſince he knows there were divers *Arian* Councils, and one of them, that of *Ariminum*, conſiſted of 550 Biſhops, the moſt numerous Aſſembly of Biſhops perhaps as ever was; except he accounts *Arians* for *Trinitarians*; which if he do, then he cannot chuſe but reckon Mr. *Biddle* for one too; for he Titles his Book, *The Apoſtolical and True Opinion concerning the Holy Trinity revived and aſſerted.*

5. According to what I have given my ſelf leave to read in the Controvertiſts of theſe Times concerning that Matter, I mean *Curcellæus* and *Mareſius*, *Sandius*, and *Gardner*, and *Bull*, *Petavius*, *Biddle*, *Eſtwich*, and *Le Clerk*; I reckon *Curcellæus*, *Biddle*, and *Le Clerk* to be the more free and ingenuous Writers, and therefore more likely to give a true Judgment concerning the Matters they enquire of.

But, 6. I conclude my Judgment with that of the great Proteſtant Champion *Chillingworth*, *chap. 6. n. 56.* —— " By the Religion of Proteſtants, " I do not underſtand the Doctrine " of *Luther*, or *Calvin*, or *Melanchon*; " nor the Confeſſion of *Auguſta* or " *Geneva*, nor the Catechiſm of *Heidelburgh*, nor the Articles of the Church " of *England*, no, nor the Harmony " of Proteſtant Confeſſions; but that " wherein they all agree, and which " they all Subſcribe with a greater " Harmony, as a perfect Rule of their " Faith and Actions, that is, the BIBLE, the BIBLE, the BIBLE " only is the Religion of Proteſtants! " whatſoever elſe they believe, beſides " it, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable Conſequences of it, well " may they hold it as a Matter of Opinion, but as Matter of Faith and " Religion; neither can they, with coherence to their own Grounds, believe it themſelves, nor require the " Belief of it of others, without moſt " high and moſt ſchiſmatical Preſumption. I (for my part) after a long, " and as I verily believe and hope, " impartial ſearch of the true Way to " Eternal Happineſs, do profeſs plainly, that I cannot find any reſt for the " ſole of my Foot, but upon this Rock " only. I ſee plainly, and with mine " own Eyes, that there are Popes againſt Popes, Councils againſt Councils, ſome Fathers againſt others, the " ſame Fathers againſt themſelves; a " Conſent of Fathers of one Age, againſt a Conſent of Fathers of another Age; the Church of one Age, " againſt the Church of another Age. —— " No Tradition, but only of " Scripture, can derive it ſelf from " the Fountain —— In a word, there " is no ſufficient certainty but of " Scripture only, for any conſidering " Man to build upon. I would not have Dr. *Wallis* think to impoſe upon us in this Reign of a Proteſtant King and Queen, the Doctrine of Tradition; he had better have done it in the late King's Time, then it would

would have been acceptable to the Court.

Sir, I hope (proceeded my Neighbour) you are by this time convinced how unjuſtly and unlike a Scholar the Doctor (pardon, I pray, my Reſentment) has drawn ſo black an Indictment againſt the *Socinians*, upon falſe Grounds, taken for granted by him to be true. I am aſhamed to read his words: *Nor do the Anti-Trinitarians inſiſt on any other Ground, why they deny it,* [the Trinity, or Three Perſons of One God] *ſave only, That it ſeems to them abſolutely impoſſible; and therefore think themſelves bound to put another ſenſe on all places of Scripture (how clear ſoever they be, or can be) which prove or favour it.* It's the contradiction of that Doctrine to a Thouſand clear places of Scripture, which they inſiſt upon, as I have ſhew'd before: But I will purſue it a little further. Will the Doctor deny that the Perſon of the Father is God? No, his Opinion aſſerts it. Will he then deny, That he who is God, is not All-ſufficient or Almighty? If that One Perſon be All-ſufficient, (and he is not God if he be not) then all other Perſons, beſides him, muſt of neceſſity be ſuperfluous, and the introducing them into the Godhead is plain Polytheiſm, and a direct Contradiction to the firſt Commandment of the Decalogue, and to all thoſe Texts that aſſert God to be One, and conſequently to thoſe Scriptures that ſpeak of God as One Perſon, which are without number. No, they firſt devis'd an Opinion, which is contrary to the cleareſt Scriptures, and then they would perſwade us it is a Myſtery, either which we cannot underſtand, and therefore muſt be blind to the Contradictions that are in it; or, if we will not be ſo ſatisfied, they call us *Clamorous* and *Importune*, and perſecute us with the moſt odious Imputations they can invent, and then with Fire and Faggot. But that they may ſeem to give ſome Anſwer to thoſe plain Scriptures and Reaſons that ſhine in their Eyes, they ſoar aloft, quite out of ſight, with Metaphyſicks, or ſo near out of ſight, that we can ſee nothing but a Cloud. The Notion of One God, and One Perſon that is that One God, every Man and Woman can underſtand; that is, they know perfectly that One Perſon that is God, cannot be Two Perſons, each of which is God: and except they had been us'd from their Infancy, to ſay like Parrots, that Three Perſons are One God, and each One of them is that God, they would eaſily ſee the Contradictions of it. And indeed the Common People do worſhip God, far more agreeable to his Will, than the Learned; for theſe are obliged by the *Athanaſian* Creed, in worſhipping One God, to mind him as Three Perſons, that is, to have in their Mind the Idea of One Almighty and only wiſe Perſon, who is One God by himſelf, and in the ſame Act to Adore two other Perſons, each of which is as much God by himſelf, as the former. To worſhip Three that are equal one to another, and at the ſame time, and in the ſame Act to worſhip but One. But the Common People worſhip One only Almighty and moſt Merciful Father, through the Son

as

as Mediator, except they confound them with expreſs Mention of Two other Perſons; and then they worſhip expreſly Three Gods, as the Learned do always more ſubtilly. God Almighty, even the Father, knows, he has given us a Commandment, That we ſhould worſhip him as One, the only Wiſe, the only Good, the only True, the only Holy, the only Potentate, and none other as God beſides him; which Commandment is as eaſy to be known by all the People that have Reaſon enough to underſtand Numbers, the difference between One and more than One, as it is neceſſary to be obſerved; but is impoſſible to be obſerved, becauſe impoſſible to be apprehended by the Common People, at leaſt, if the *Athanaſian* Doctrine be true Divinity. *Hear, O* Iſrael, *the Lord our God is One Lord:* And, *Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all Thine Heart, with all thy Soul, and with all thy Might,* (*Deut.* 6. 4, 5.) But how ſhall we do to love each of Three Perſons that are equal, with all our Hearts? All the poor Labourers, with their Wives, in the Country, and all the Tankard-bearers of *London*, muſt go to School to Dr. *Wallis*, and he will teach them Metaphyſicks and Mathematicks, and read a Lecture to them upon the Three Dimenſions, *Long*, *Broad*, and *Tall*, of *One Cube*: They muſt love God the Father, who is the Length of the Cube, with all their Hearts, and then God the Son, who is the Breadth, with all their Hearts too, and God the Holy Ghoſt in the ſame manner too.

And if we meaſure this Cube with the Infallible Rule of Scripture, we find that this Long Cube [the Father] ſent this Broad Cube [the Son] on a Meſſage, as far as from Heaven to Earth, [*John* 6. 38.] and anon after ſent this tall or deep Cube [the Holy Ghoſt] after him, [*Matth.* 3. 16.] in the mean time he abode in Heaven himſelf. Moreover, this broad Cube [the Son] is not commenſurable with this long Cube the Father, neither Northward nor Southward, in Knowledg (*Mark* 13. 32.) or Power, (*John* 14. 28.) In like manner this tall Cube [the Holy Ghoſt] receives of this long and broad Cube to make him taller and deeper, *John* 16. 14.

I fancy the poor People would apprehend it better by ſuch a Reſemblance as this: Suppoſe one Woman (*Mary*) to be married to Three Men at once, *Peter*, *James*, and *John*; *I*, Mary, *take thee* Peter, James, *and* John *to be my wedded Husband*, &c. Here are indeed Three Perſons, but only One Husband; the Husbandhood is but One, though the Perſons are Three, each of which is Husband to *Mary*, and *Mary* is obliged, by the Contract of Marriage, to pay Conjugal Affection and Duty to each of them. Methinks this is a more familiar parallel than that of a Cube. I do the rather make uſe of this Similitude, becauſe the Learned and Famous Dr. *Sherlock*, in his Vindication of the Doctrine of the Bleſſed Trinity, tells us, "We muſt allow "the Divine Perſons to be real ſub-"ſtantial Beings, *Pag.* 47. And in *Pag.* 67. he ſaith, "The Father—— "feels himſelf to be the Father, and "not the Son, nor the Holy Ghoſt: "The Son in like manner feels "himſelf to be the Son, and not "the Father, nor Holy Ghoſt; and

"ſo

" ſo the Holy Ghoſt——As *James* " feels himſelf to be *James*, and not " *Peter* nor *John*, which proves them " to be diſtinct Perſons. Thus Dr. *Wallis* may ſee that his Notions concerning the Trinity are old faſhion'd, Dr. *Sherlock*'s are of the new Mode. But if he deſires to have his Reſemblances further diſplayed, I am told he may find them ſufficiently expos'd in a Book, written in *French*, titled *Le Nouveau Viſionaire* againſt M. *Jurieu*.

Here I did confeſs indeed that Dr. *Sherlock*'s Explanation of the Diſtinction of Perſons was far more clear and full than yours: But I had thought the Orthodox would not have granted ſo much, and ſo it ſeems did you too. By this time we came near the end of your Letter; in which, he ſaid, there were ſtill the ſame Calumnies over and over. Only he took notice of one Text of Scripture you inſert, which you had not before, namely *John* 1. 1, 14. *The Word was God*, and, *The Word was made Fleſh*. This (ſaith he) I confeſs were to the purpoſe; if by the term *The Word* could be meant nothing elſe but a Pre-exiſting Perſon, and by the term *God* nothing but God Almighty the Creator of Heaven and Earth, and if taking thoſe terms in thoſe Senſes did not make St. *John* write Nonſenſe; and if by Fleſh could be meant nothing but a Man, how excellent ſoever, and not a Mortal Man, ſubject to Infirmities: But all theſe things are otherwiſe.

For, 1. The Ancient Orthodox Senſe, at the Council of *Nice*, and afterwards for ſome Centuries, was this: In the beginning of the World, or before all Worlds, the Son of God did exiſt, and that Son was with God his Father, and that Son was *very God of very God*, not numerically, but ſpecifically, as *Peter* and *Paul* are of the ſame Subſtance. Now this Opinion was rejected by the Schoolmen, as introducing two Gods. And the Modern Orthodox underſtand it thus: " In " the beginning before all Worlds, or " from Eternity, the Son a diſtinct " Perſon did exiſt, and that Son was " with God his Father, and the Son " was that God with whom he was. But if they be tied to take the terms in the ſenſe of their Opinion, they muſt expound thus: " The Son *was* " *with God*, that is, with the Father, " himſelf and the Holy Ghoſt; and " the Son was the Father, Son, and " Holy Ghoſt. Or, according to Dr. *Wallis*, the Breadth of the Cube, was with the Length, Breadth and Depth of the ſame Cube, and the Breadth was the Cube. And for the fourteenth Verſe, they ſay not, the Word or Son was made Fleſh, but, God the Son by the Holy Ghoſt coming upon the bleſſed Virgin, and the Power of the moſt High overſhadowing her, was united to a Human Body and Soul. The *Arian* Senſe you may ſee in a late Tract, entituled, *A Vindication of the Unitarians*, That God firſt made a Super-Angelical Being, call'd the Son, and through that Son, and by the Holy Ghoſt, fram'd this World, and Man within it; This Being was with *God*, and was an Angelical *God*; and this Son, call'd *The Word*, became Incarnate. The *Socinian* Senſe was thus: In the beginning of the Goſpel (*Mark* 1. 1.) was Jeſus called the Word, becauſe he was the prime and chief Expounder and Miniſter of the Goſpel; and this Word was with God, aſcended into Heaven, (*John* 3. 13.) and deſcended thence, and being anointed with the Holy Ghoſt and Power, being thus ſanctified, and ſent into the World, was far more

deſervedly called the Son of God, and God, then thoſe among the Jews to whom the Word of God came, who yet were called Gods, (*John* 10. 35, 36.) or than that Angel who appeared to *Manoch*, (*Judg.* 13. 22.) And the Evangeliſt having ſaid in *Verſ.* 12. that this true Light, as well as Word, or Light-Bringer, gave Power to thoſe that believed in him to be the Sons of God, he ſays in *Verſ.* 14. that He, the Word, was himſelf, as well as they, a Mortal and Frail Man.

The Senſe of *Paul* Biſhop of *Antioch An.* 262. (as I have read ſomewhere in *Melanthon*) and the Senſe of ſome in our Days was, That this term *Beginning*, muſt be taken for the beginning of the World; and the term *The Word*, being the Subject of the Hiſtory in the very Front of it, muſt be taken properly, and by way of eminence, for the Goſpel Word. But a Word, according to *Ariſtotle*, being twofold, Internal in the Mind, and External in the Speech, the Word here ſpoken of, muſt mean the Internal Word of God by way of excellence, that is, the Goſpel Decree, as it is taken alſo in *Titus* 1. 3. where the Apoſtle *Paul*, having mentioned the Truth which is after Godlineſs, in hope of Eternal Life, goes on and ſays, *which God, that cannot lye, promiſed* [decreed to promiſe, or in purpoſe promiſed] *before the World began:* hath in due time manifeſted *his Word* [τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ,] through preaching. This Word was with or in God, not yet manifeſted: and the *Word was God*; here *God* being the Predicate, muſt have ſuch a Senſe as can agree to the Subject *Word*, either moſt Divine, as *Spirit* for *Spiritual*, *John* 6. 63. and the very term *God*, *Gal.* 1. 10. for the Doctrine of the Goſpel, and in the 18th Verſe of this Chapter, *John* 1. in the ſame Senſe; or as *Grotius* would have it, for the Word of God: but the former Senſe ſeems far better: All things were made by it, to wit, as a Rule or chief Deſign. According to this Expoſition, the *Word* muſt not be taken for a Perſon in the firſt five Verſes, nor till the Evangeliſt had ſaid in the ſixth and ſeventh Verſes, That the Baptiſt being a Man ſent of God, was not the Light which was in the Word mention'd, that is, was not the Bringer or Preacher of the Light; for that muſt be the Senſe, when a Man is ſaid to be, or not to be the Light. But that which is denied of *John*, is affirmed of another, to whom he bare Witneſs, and that was Jeſus, as appears afterwards. He was the true Light, that is, Light-Bringer, which coming into the World, enlightneth every Man. And now having laid a ſufficient Ground for taking the *Light*, in an improper Senſe, for Light-Bringer, his meaning cannot eaſily be miſtaken, when in the fourteenth Verſe, he calls the ſame Man *The Word*, that is, the perſonal Word, or Great Goſpel-Prophet, and ſays, That *The Word* was, was made, or was born Fleſh; that is, a Frail and Mortal Man, (not barely a Man) for ſo the Word *Fleſh* does always ſignify when it's applied to Man; and Chriſt is now a Man, but not Fleſh. *The Word was made Fleſh*, does not imply that this great Word, Prophet, or Meſſenger of that Word, did exiſt before he was born, no more than that Phraſe in 1 *Cor.* 15. 45. *The firſt Man* Adam *was made a living Soul*, proves or implies that *Adam* did pre-exiſt before he was made a living Soul.

Here,

Here, Sir, I interpoſed, and told my Gentleman, That this Expoſition ſeem'd very uncouth and ſtrange; I had never heard of it before, and therefore it was not eaſy for me to apprehend it, much more to receive it. He readily conſented to what I ſaid; and added, That it's a thing which makes Unitarian Interpretations ſeem forc'd and unnatural, namely, becauſe we have imbib'd from our Youth, and even from our Catechiſms, contrary Expoſitions: But if they were both propos'd to one that had never heard of either of 'em before, he was perſwaded the Trinitarian Expoſitions would ſeem far more harſh and forc'd, nay, contradictious and abſurd. For, to inſtance in this very Text of *John*, what un-prejudiced Man could ever imagine that this Text ſhould be the Ground of the Doctrine of Two Perſons in God, when nothing is more clear in Scripture and Reaſon, than the Unity of God, which neceſſarily implies the Unity of his Perſon. I have been the larger in ſetting out this Expoſition (ſaith he) becauſe I knew it would be difficult for you to apprehend it.

There is yet another Expoſition of this Scripture, which is derived from the Great *Grotius*, and may be found in the *Brief Hiſtory of the Unitarians*, which I ſpoke of. But I think I have ſaid enough to convince any Man that is not extreamly prejudic'd, that this is an obſcure Scripture: For as every one of theſe Senſes finds ſome ſpecious Grounds in the Text, ſo never a one of them can clearly anſwer all the Objections that are levied againſt them, and that of the *Trinitarians* leaſt of all: Therefore your Doctor writes, either unlike a Divine, or like a Cenſorious, I will not ſay Malicious Perſon; when he ſays, If God ſay, *The Word was God*, and *The Word was made Fleſh*; ſhall we ſay, not ſo, only becauſe we cannot tell How? As if theſe Sayings were ſo clear, that they admitted no Senſe but his, which underſtands by *The Word* an Eternally pre-exiſting Perſon, whereas the term *Ho Logos* in Greek, which we tranſlate *The Word*, Speech, or Saying, is found (I ſuppoſe) forty times in the New Teſtament taken imperſonally for the Goſpel, or ſome Speech: It's Three and twenty times ſo uſed in this One Evangeliſt of St. *John*, and for the moſt part oppos'd to the Perſon of Chriſt; and on the other hand, there is not one Text, except this in 1 *John* 1. 14. where it can reaſonably ſignify a Perſon, except we reckon that in 1 *John* 5. 7. for one, which I have ſhew'd to be uncertain, and not to have the Authority of other Sacred Scripture. As for that in *Rev.* 19. 13. —— *his Name is called, The Word of God*, that is, not the ſame with *The Word* ſimply; and though it denote a Perſon, yet it's one whoſe Veſture was dipt in Blood, which ſhews him to be *a Man*, a glorious Captain. Let all rational Men judge, Whether it's more reaſonable to take a term in ſuch Senſe, as it's almoſt always to be found in in the ſame Divine Author, than in the Senſe of *Philo* a Jew, or *Plato* a Heathen. So that the *Unitarians* have far the moſt reaſon to cry out of forc'd Interpretations, whereby to deprive God of an incommunicable Attribute, even his Unity: And they defend theſe Interpretations with ſuch Diſtinctions, as are either not intelligible, or which inſer abſurd Conſe-

quences; Such are the Distinctions between the Essence and the Divine Persons; of the threefold manner of Existence of God; of Circumincession, or the mutual Penetration or mutual Inexistence of the Divine Persons among themselves; of God taken personally and essentially in Scripture; of the Name *Father* sometimes signifying the Father alone, sometimes the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; of the Eternal Generation, or God's Eternal begetting a Son equal to himself, and yet not another God; of the Divine Operations within and without the Essence, whence it is that the Internal are attributed to the Persons distinctly, the External to them all Three, though One only be named; of the Incarnation, or God the Son not being made a Man, but joyning himself to a Man in an Hypostatical Union; hence of two Natures in One Person, of the Communication of Properties, whereby that which is spoken of Christ's Divine Nature, is understood to agree to him according to his Humane Nature, and *vice versâ*: and many more confounding Distinctions they use, without which the Holy Scriptures cannot be understood in the Sense of *Trinitarians*: but I am weary with reciting them. Here he broke off, and I rose to take my leave of him. I told him, as the truth is, That I had long taken the Doctrine of the Trinity for granted, and began but now to inquire into it, therefore could not readily reply to those things he had urged, who, I perceived, was well vers'd in the Point; but I would further consider it. He thank'd me much for my Friendly Visit and Patience in hearing him, and hop'd to see me again shortly upon this Occasion.

Now, Sir, give me leave to tell you, that though I was much satisfied with your Letter, taking it for granted you had given a true Representation of the *Socinians*, yet finding by this Discourse, it is far otherwise with them, that they have as high a Veneration for the Holy Scripture as we, that they use their Reason no more than reasonable Men ought to do, *viz.* for the finding out the true Sense of Scripture; that they reject the Doctrine of the Trinity, not only because it's contrary to Reason, but more especially because it's contrary to most plain and clear Scriptures, as they conceive; that they have no need of those nice Distinctions that we are forc'd to make use of; that the Texts you alledge against them as most clear, are notwithstanding very doubtful and obscure. For these Reasons, and others of this Kind, I am more dissatisfied in this Matter than I was at first, because I perceive by your Letter, that nothing convincing can be urged against them, even by them that are most Learned, such as you are. If you can and will please to take upon you the trouble of another Letter, to answer these my Scruples and Doubts, you will add thereby much more strength to the many Obligations wherein you have already bound,

SIR,

Your much obliged——

Postscript.

Poſtſcript.

SIR,

I Had no ſooner finiſh'd my Letter, but you were pleaſed to ſend me another, which is an Anſwer to a Letter you received from an unknown Gentleman, propoſing ſome Objections againſt your former Letter. My Gentleman hearing of it, came to give me a Viſit, and when he had read this your ſecond Letter, he made his Exceptions to two or three Paſſages in it.

1. You ſay, *By Perſonality, I mean that Diſtinction (whatever it be) whereby the Three are diſtinguiſhed; but what that is, I do not pretend to determine. And if I ſhould gueſs, for it will be but gueſſing,* &c.

Now (ſaith he) our Saviour in the Holy Scripture tells us plainly, *This is Life Eternal, that they might know thee (Father) the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent,* Joha 17. 3. Do not theſe Names and Characters diſtinguiſh the one from the other? Does any thing diſtinguiſh Two Perſons more fully, than that the one is Father to the other, and the other his Son? The one prayeth, the other is prayed unto. The one is not only God, but the only true God; the other is he whom the Father, the only true God hath ſent: and he that is ſent by him is Jeſus, the Name of that Man who was the Son of the Virgin *Mary*; and the Name *Chriſt* ſignifies, that he was anointed with the Holy Ghoſt and Power, for the performance of that Office of ſaving Men from their Sins, whereunto he was ſent by the only true God his Father. I challenge the Learned Doctor, and the Learneſt Doctor at *Oxford*, (if there be any more Learned than he) to ſhew me a clearer or plainer Diſtinction between God and *Moſes*.

So that Dr. *Wallis*'s not pretending to determine the Diſtinction between God the Sender, and Jeſus Chriſt the Sent, but calling that Determination *Guſſing*, is in effect to deny the Authority of Chriſt's Words, and to call his clear and full determination of that which we are to know for obtaining the Eternal Life, *Guſſing*.

In his next Paragraph, ſpeaking of the ſame Matter, he Complements ſome Body, *craving leave to be ignorant of what the Scripture doth not tell him.* Now if I did not conſider the vaſt power Prejudice and long Prepoſſeſſion have over Mens Minds, I ſhould determine the Doctor to be wilfully blind: But it's plain, he bears falſe Witneſs againſt our Lord, and the Holy Scrip-

Scripture, whilſt he ſays the Scripture doth not tell him, what it plainly tells him and every Woman that can but read it.

The following Paragraph is *Of the damnatory* SENTENCES in the *Athanaſian* Creed, *which ſeem*, ſay you, *to be annexed only to ſome Generals, which the Author thought neceſſary*, as the Trinity and Incarnation of Chriſt. To which he excepted thus: This Creed being made (as it ſeems to the Learned) many hundreds of Years after the Apoſtles Creed, which contains all General Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, and two or three hundred Years after the *Nicene* Creed, which explains the Doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation more particularly, the Author of it was very impertinent, if he did not deſign all his Explications to be believed upon pain of Damnation. But if that Argument were wanting, who can read the *Athanaſian* Creed, and find *Damnation* in the beginning, middle, and concluſion, and can then have the face to deny, that the not believing of every Clauſe is damnable? I am ſorry to find ſo much Daubing in Dr. *Wallis*.

Then we came to your further explaining the parallel of the Cube; where you ſay, it may be ſaid of it, that, *This long Thing is a Cube, and ſo, This which is broad, or this which is high is a Cube.* But then (ſaith he) he that ſays, This long Thing is a Cube, doth in ſo ſaying, ſay, This long Thing is broad and high: conſequently in Parallel each Perſon is Three Perſons.

This is all he took notice of at that time, for he was in haſte. And I having conſidered what he had ſaid before, and finding ſo much Reaſon and Suitableneſs to Scripture in it, could not tell how to defend theſe Paſſages, and therefore remit them to you, hoping you will honour with a Return,

SIR,

Your——

Whether

Whether Trinity or Unity more dangerous?

THE Trinitarians and Unitarians agree that there is but one God moſt High: they both agree that the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt is that God moſt High. They differ in this, that Jeſus before he was a Man and from Eternity, and alſo the Holy Ghoſt, as diſtinct Perſons from God the Father, were and are each of them as perfectly God moſt High as the Father; ſo that each of them is Almighty, Eternal, All-knowing, only Wiſe, only Good, Infinite, *&c.* equal to the Father. The Trinitarians aſſert theſe things, the Unitarians deny them.

The Queſtion hereupon is, Which of theſe Parties are in the moſt dangerous Error, ſuppoſing them to be in Error, now the one, now the other?

If the Trinitarians err, they worſhip two Perſons in God equal to one that is undoubtedly God, that is, they worſhip three Almighty and only Wiſe Perſons, which are not diſtinguiſhable from three moſt High Gods.

If the Unitarians err, they avoid that Error of worſhipping three Perſons which they cannot diſtinguiſh from three Gods; but their Error lies in holding ſo ſtrictly to the Oneneſs of God, as well in Perſon as Eſſence, that they do not acknowledg, beſides that One, two more Perſons to be equally God, as well as that One, whom both Parties agree to be ſo: that is, they err in not acknowledging two unneceſſary Perſons in God, but holding that the God and Father of Chriſt is God alone, only neceſſary and all-ſufficient.

If the Trinitarians err, they err againſt the common Reaſon of Mankind, and moſt plain and expreſs Scriptures, which aſſert that God is One, or that there is but one Supream God, and always ſpeak of him as one only Perſon. If the Unitarians err, they err againſt the doubtful Senſe of ſome obſcure Texts, which more fairly admit of another Interpretation conſiſtent with the Unity of the Perſon of God.

In ſhort, the Queſtion is, Whether the Term *God* includes only one Perſon, or three Perſons? one Almighty Perſon, or three diſtinct Almighty Perſons? And whether the former or the latter is the more dangerous Error, which ſoever is found an Error?

FINIS.

OBSERVATIONS
ON THE
Four Letters
OF
Dr. John Wallis,
Concerning the
TRINITY
AND THE
Creed of Athanasius.

LONDON:
Printed in the Year, M.DC.XCI.

OBSERVATIONS
ON THE
Four Letters
OF
Dr. *JOHN WALLIS*, &c.

SIR, I thank you for Dr. *W*'s Third Letter (or rather Book) which you brought to my House. You not finding me at home, prevented our discourſing together of it: therefore I have given you here, my thoughts of his performance therein. And becauſe in this, he has reviewed and explained his former Letters; I alſo will *again* conſider them.

The Deſign of Dr. Wallis *his Letters, conſider'd.*

HE tells us (at *pag.* 10. and 18. of his firſt Letter, and at *pag.* 38. of the third Letter) what is the deſign of theſe Letters; to prove, ſays he, that ‘ *What are in one regard Three, may in another regard be but One:* ‘ and if I have ſufficiently evinced this, I ‘ have done what I undertook. And in ſo ‘ doing, have removed the great Objection, ‘ which the *Socinians* would caſt in our way; ‘ and becauſe of which, they think themſelves obliged to ſhuffle off other Arguments. To prove his Propoſition, He alledges in his firſt Letter; that the three Dimenſions (Length, Breadth and Heighth) of a Cubical Body, are but one Cube. He adds there; to *Be*, to *Know*, and to *Do*, are diſtinct from each other: yet 'tis one and the ſame Soul, which *Is*, and *Knows*, and *Does*. Further; Underſtanding, Will, and Memory, are all in the ſame Soul. And *Unum, verum,*

bonum are but the same *Ens*. To enlighten the dull *Socinians* by familiar and easy Examples, he minds them (at *pag.* 42. of the Third Letter) that, Three Groats make but One Shilling, Three Nobles but one Pound. He dilates upon these Instances; especially *that noble one* of the Cube (of which he has, he saith at *pag.* 18. of the Fourth Letter, considered *above Forty Years*) in several Pages: and he is so serious and earnest, that I verily think, the Doctor is sincere and honest; and doth indeed imagine, that this is the point in question; 'Whether what are in one re-'gard Three, may not in another regard be 'but One?

Therefore, Sir, I pray tell him from me; that the *Socinians* will grant him, what he imagines is the thing in Question, and much *more to it*. They will not put Dr. *Wallis*, upon proving that, what in one regard are an Hundred, a Thousand, or even an Infinite Number, may in another regard be but One. An Hundred Souldiers make but one Company, a Thousand but one Regiment, an Infinite Number of Moments make but one Eternity. Tell him, the Question is, Whether (as St. *Paul* expresly teaches, *Gal.* 3. 20.) *God is One?* or (as Holy Mother Church, and *Alma mater Academia*) *God is Three?* Whether there are or can be Three *Infinite, Almighty and All-wise* Persons; or only One *such* Person or Being? Which the *Socinians*, guided by natural and common Notions, think to be as much as, Whether there are Three Gods, or but One God? They affirm the latter, the *Trinitarians* the former.

But you will say; the reason why the *Socinians* deny that God can be Three, or that there are Three Infinite Persons or Intelligent Beings, is, *because God being but One, cannot be Three:* and here comes in the Doctor's Solution, *What are in one regard Three, may in another regard be but One.* And this he proves by Instances, as, that in a Cube there are three Dimensions, and yet but one Cube; and several such like.

I answer; The Doctor first raises (in the Name of the *Socinians*) an impertinent Objection; and then solves it by Instances. The *Socinians* do not deny, that the One true God is Three Persons, *because what is in one regard but One, cannot in another be Three*; of which no Man ever was so fooliſh as to doubt; but for the Reasons mentioned in the First Letter of the *Brief History* of the *Unitarians*. If the Doctor would have proved a particular Proposition, in favour of the Trinity; this was the Proposition to have been proved, 'What 'are in one regard Three, may in another 'regard be *so* One; that all of them (*toge-'ther*) are but One, and yet each of them '(*singly* and by Himself) is *that One*. For so they say of the (pretended) Trinity. The Three Persons (say they) *together* are the one true God: yet each of them, *singly* and by himself, is the one true God. Each of them is so perfectly God, and that one true God; that he hath the whole Divine Nature and Essence, is an Infinite Almighty and All-wise Person. This is that monstrous Paradox and Contradiction, that the Doctor should have proved; and which he and his Party charge upon the Word of God it self. This is that, which, because all other Arguments failed them, in their Disputations with the *Photinians* and *Arians*; they at last effectually proved, by the Imperial Edicts, by Confiscations and Banishments, by seizing and burning all Books written against it or them, by Capital Punishments, and when the Papacy (*of which this is the chief Article*) prevailed, by Fire and Faggot.

Let us now (briefly) consider the Doctor's notable Instances. Three Groats are but one Shilling, saith the Doctor: Very well; but each Groat, *singly* and by it self, is not a Shilling. Three Nobles are but one Pound: but each Noble, *single* and by it self, is but the third Part of a Pound. To *be*, to *know*, and to *do*, are in the Soul; so are Understanding, Will, and Memory; as also *Verum, Bonum, Unum:* but no one of them, *singly*, is the Soul, or a Soul. Long, broad, and high, are Dimensions in a Cube: But *long*, singly and by itself, is not a Cube, but only a Line; *long* and

and *broad* are not a Cube, but only a Superficies; long, broad, and high *together* are the Cube. But 'tis far otherways in the (pretended) Trinity. There Father, Son and Spirit *together*, are the One true God; as long, broad, and high, are the Cube: and yet each of those Persons, *singly*, and by himself, is (saith their Creed) *Perfect God*, has the whole Divine Nature, or whole Nature and Perfections of God; though (in the alledged parallel) neither long, broad, nor high, is the Cube, has the whole Cubical Nature, or whole Nature and Perfections of a Cube. Therefore say I, this instance of a Cube and its three Dimensions, does not quadrate to the (imagin'd) Trinity, or help us to conceive *its Possibility or Consistency*.

But saith the Doctor (at *pag.* 9. of the second Letter,) 'Thô we cannot say (*in* 'the *Abstract*) that Length is a Cube, and 'so of the rest; yet (*in the Concrete*) we 'may say, this long thing (or this which 'is long) is a Cube. Just so, we do not 'say (in the Abstract) *Paternity* is God; 'but (in the Concrete) the Father is God; 'and so of the other Persons. The *Perso*'*nality* is not said to be God; but the Per'son is. Which fully answers the Excep'tion.

So it is; when they find themselves distrest, by a clear either Argument or Answer, they fly to Metaphysicks, and Terms of the canting Schools. Then come in *Abstract*, *Concrete*, *Paternity*, *Personality*, and an Infinity of other barbarous and insignificant Words: only to hide clear Truth from Persons, who can be shifted off with obscure and senseless Words; Words which denote nothing that is really existent in Nature, but only the Chimera's of the Metaphysician. Show me that Trinitarian, who dares dispute this Question (about the Trinity) *in plain English*, by any sort of Arguments; whether Arguments from Scripture, from Reason, or from Authority of first and pure Antiquity. No, no; They never durst attempt this, nor ever will: for they know the Cause is lost, if *the People* be permitted to understand it, and the Reasons *for* and *against* it. But the comfort is; Those who are at all capable of judging these *Gothish* and *Vandalic* Terms, are much more capable of discerning, when they are detected and confuted. Therefore to this *Flourish* of the Doctor, I reply.

'Tis somewhat surprizing, that a Mathematician should not be more considerate; in giving an Instance belonging to his Profession. He tells us, we may say in the Concrete, *This long Thing is a Cube*. I deny it. This long Thing is only *a Line*; this *long and broad* Thing, is only a Superficies, or one side of a Cube; 'tis only *this long, broad, and high* Thing, that is a Cube. But if the Doctor meant, 'This long Thing, '*which is also broad and high*, is a Cube; and 'were it not broad and high, it were not 'a Cube, but a Line, or one side of a Cube: then this is no Parallel to the matter in hand, the Trinity. For then this Proposition, *This long Thing is a Cube*, is but the same with this, *This long, broad, and high* Thing, is a Cube: which will not at all help the Doctor. *Long*, *broad*, and *high* of the Cube, answer, to Father, Son, and Spirit of the Godhead or God; and the Cube it-self answers to God or the Godhead: so far we are well. But now say I; thô we may say, *This long thing is a Cube*, meaning this thereby; 'This long Thing, which is 'also broad and high, is a Cube; and were 'it not broad and high, it were not a Cube: yet we cannot say, *the Father is God*, and mean thereby, 'The Father, who is also 'the Son, and Holy Spirit, is God; and 'were He not withal the Son, and Holy 'Spirit, He were not God. So we must speak, to make out the Parallel: but so to speak, All know, is Heresy; for the Father is not the Son and Spirit, nor are they the Father. Therefore the Concrete way of speaking, will no more favour the Doctor's Parallel, than the Abstract. And he ought to have seen this; when he was advised of it, in a private Letter by *W. I.* without publish-

publiſhing to the World, that even upon ſecond Thoughts he underſtood not, *a Thing ſelf-evident.*

But ſuppoſing now, That the Doctor's Inſtances did enable us, to conceive this particular Difficulty, in the Doctrine of the Trinity: does he not know, that there are many more; of which himſelf will not pretend, that his Inſtances or Solutions are at all applicable to them? I ſay this; becauſe his Letters bear this *haughty* Title, *The Doctrine of the Bleſſed Trinity, and the Athanaſian Creed, Explained.* Do theſe Explications reach the tenth Part of the Contradictions, charged on the Doctrines of the Incarnation and Trinity, and on the Athanaſian Creed? What are the Dimenſions of a Cube, or the Parts of a Shilling or of a Pound, to the chief Abſurdities in thoſe Doctrines and that Creed? I will mention but ſome of them. They tell us of, a Son receiving of his Father, being Life and Godhead; and yet as old as his Father. And theſe two, Father and Son, loving one another; *their Mutual Love is a Third Perſon* and Spirit, equal to themſelves. This Spirit, though but an effect, is as early as its Cauſes; and *the ſame with them.* They tell us of an Infinite Perſon, who is, *whole and all*, united; without Leſſening or Contraction of himſelf, to a Finite Man. They tell us of a *Perfect God* and a *Perfect Man*, who are not Two, but One Perſon; though God (they ſay) is Three Perſons; and every Man (all know) is One Perſon, becauſe a reaſonable Soul, and an humane Body are a Perſon. They tell us one while, that two Intelligent Natures are but One Perſon: another while, on the contrary; Three Perſons are but one *Numerical* Nature. They tell us, each Perſon has the whole Divine Nature, and cannot be ſeparated from it; They tell us farther, All the Divine Perſons are inſeparably in the Divine Nature: from whence we have this firſt Corollary, that each Perſon is the other Two Perſons; and then this (contrary to what the Doctor holds, at *pag.* 33. of the third Letter) that when the ſecond Perſon was Incarnate, ſo alſo muſt the First and Third. They tell us of a Son *begotten* in the moſt perfect Manner from all Eternity; yet is ſtill *in begetting* (for the action of Generation in God, ſay they, never ceaſes, becauſe that would ſuppoſe ſome Change in God) and ever ſhall be ſo: and the like of the Spirit. They tell us, their Trin-Unity is but One, as it is *but One God*; and is Three, as it is Three *ſuch* Perſons, that each of them is (ſingly and by himſelf) a God, that is, 'tis Three in this regard, that 'tis *Three Gods*: ſo that at length their *Trin-unity is* (what Dr. *Wallis* all along abhors, as both falſe and impoſſible) *Three, in the ſame regard that it is but One.* For the regard is *God*, in both Propoſitions: in the firſt it is *One God*, in the other (though not in the bare Sound, yet in the Signification of the words) it is *Three Gods.* To add now no more; whoever does not believe all theſe (and many the like) Inconſiſtences; and that, whether he can or no; ſhall be damned. They lay the greateſt ſtreſs upon this Laſt; becauſe without this, few would mind the other. And this is the reaſon, they have ſo conſtantly and abſolutely refuſed to part with the Damnatory Clauſes in the Athanaſian Creed: to part with them, is to give away all the other Articles.

Of theſe, or any of theſe, I think Dr. *Wallis* will not ſay, that his little Congruities, or rather *Umbrages*, are Explications or Solutions. He has offer'd, but at very few of them: However, I will conſider even the little he has ſaid.

At *pag.* 34. of the third Letter he ſays; 'Let one face of a Cube, ſuppoſe *the Baſe*, 'admit a ſoil or dark Colour; while the 'reſt of the Cube is Tranſparent: — this 'may ſomeway repreſent Chriſt's *Humiliation*; who being *equal with God*, yet took 'on him *the form of a Servant.* But can the Doctor tell me, how I may ſhut up the Baſe of an Infinite Cube, which Baſe (himſelf ſuppoſes) is Infinite; *in a Nut-ſhell?* For his Creed tells me, a Thing much more marvellous; that an Infinite Perſon is whole

and

and all, united to a Finite Man; and that without leſſening or contraction of the Infinite Spirit or Perſon.

In the ſame page of the ſame Letter, he ſays; 'God's Juſtice and Mercy are *diſtinguiſhable*, thô in God they are *not divided*: 'accordingly ſome Things are effects of his 'Juſtice; others of his Mercy: So the 'Power and Will of God, are both Individual from himſelf: but when we ſay God 'is *Omnipotent*, we do not ſay he is *Omnivolent*. — If therefore we allow as great a 'Diſtinction between the Perſons, as between the Attributes (as certainly it is not 'leſs, but ſomewhat more) there will be 'no Incongruity, in aſcribing the Incarnation to one of the Perſons, and not to the 'reſt. He argues here, as if the Incarnation were an Action: now allowing him that groſs Miſtake, I ſay; if this be any Explication of the propoſed Difficulty, he muſt allow that one Attribute may be Incarnate and not another. I ask the Doctor therefore; Can the Juſtice of God be Incarnate, and not his Mercy: or his Power, and not his Will? But I muſt tell him farther; there is *a cloſer Connexion* between the Perſons, than the Attributes: The firſt are (according to him and his Party) *in one another*; the other not ſo.

Again, at *pag.* 13. of the firſt Letter, he argues thus; 'If in this ſuppoſed Cube, we 'ſuppoſe (in order, not in time) its firſt Dimenſion, that of length, as A B: and to 'this length be given an equal breadth '(which is the true *Generation* of a Square) 'as C D: and to this Baſis of length and 'breadth be given (as a farther *Proceſſion* 'from both) an equal height E F: and all 'this eternally. Here is a fair reſemblance 'of the Father, as the Fountain or Original; 'of the Son, as generated from him from 'all Eternity; and of the Holy Ghoſt, as 'eternally proceeding from both. *And all 'this, without any Inconſiſtence.* But not without ſome Non-ſenſe. He ſuppoſes *the length* of this Cube to be the firſt Dimenſion, *in Order, not in Time.* 'Tis Non-ſenſe to ſay, *Length* is firſt of the Dimenſions, not in Time but in Order. For Priority of Order, muſt be either the Priority of Time, or of Dignity. Priority of Time, the Doctor himſelf diſclaims; becauſe it would deſtroy his Parallel: Priority of Dignity cannot be pretended between Dimenſions; which himſelf too ſuppoſes to be *equally Infinite*. Thus the Foundation of his Parallel is abſurd and falſe. But I will not ſtand upon it. I ask him, whether *length* did of it-ſelf beget *breadth*, communicating to it its whole Nature? did *length* and *breadth* of themſelves, without ſome external Agent, generate *height*, and communicate their Nature to it? If not, this is no Illuſtration, how the Father did himſelf *eternally begat* the Son, and the Father and Son *generate* the Spirit. He cautions me, that I would not *ludere cum Sacris*: He ſees, I will not; how great occaſion ſoever be given.

The Thing which in my opinion, and I believe in the Judgment of moſt Readers, deſerves beſt to be conſidered; is at *p.* 26. of the third Letter. '*Solomon*, as wiſe as 'he was, — doth yet acknowledg himſelf to 'be at a loſs; when he would ſearch out '*the bottom of Natural Things*: and ſhall we 'then ſay, of *the Deep Things of God*; It is 'impoſſible, becauſe we cannot find it out? I anſwer, *the Deep Things of God* (in the Text quoted by the Doctor) are thoſe hidden and ſecret Things, which God hath *prepared for them that love him*; ſee the alledged Text, 1 *Cor.* 2. 10, 11. Theſe *Contradictions to Reaſon and Scripture*, are not the Deep Things of God; but rather *the Depths of Satan*, (*Rev.* 2. 24.) by which he ſeeks to lead us into Polytheiſm and Idolatry.

But hitherto of the Doctor's *Deſign*, or Scope in theſe Letters; and of the Inſtances and Similitudes, by which he would confirm it.

Of

Of his Somewhats *and Perſons.*

ONE would expect, that ſince they ſay, the Trinity is the Doctrine of the Catholick or Univerſal Church, and neceſſary to be believ'd in order to Salvation; that at leaſt they knew and were agreed, what this Trinity is, or what is thereby meant; elſe we are required to believe *no Body knows what*, in order to Salvation. But ſo it is; there is *as much Confuſion*, in declaring what this *Catholic neceſſary* Doctrine is, as there was at the building of *Babel*, where no one underſtood another. As many Writers, ſo many Explications of the Trinity; neither does this happen only among the vulgar of their Learned Men; but among their Learned of the firſt Claſs and Magnitude. When any of them dares demand it; I will give an ample Account, of the Diverſity and Diviſions among their chief Doctors: ſuch Diverſity, that they have nothing left in which they agree, but only *the word* Trinity; but ſure the Word, without the Notion, is not Neceſſary to Salvation, becauſe 'tis *confeſſedly* Unſcriptural.

Let us conſider an Inſtance of this, which has lately hapned. Firſt comes forth Dr. *Sherlock*, the Churches well-known Champion againſt all *Her Foes*; that is, againſt all thoſe who believe the Holy Scriptures *without reſerve*, and believe the Church only ſo far, as they can ſee and judg that ſhe agrees with Scripture and Reaſon, a Fault *not to be purged with Sacrifice nor Offering, for ever*: this famous Combatant tells us; 'The Trinity 'is Three Infinite Beings, Minds or Spirits, 'each of which is *ſingly* and by himſelf *a* 'God; yet they are all but One God, be- 'cauſe Mutually Conſcious; that is, becauſe 'they perfectly and intimately know one 'anothers Thoughts and Actions. He is ſo ſure, this is the very Doctrine of the Trinity; that *to ſay the contrary, is* (he ſaith) *both Hereſy and Non-ſenſe*. This was ſpoken like a Vindicator: for all that, not two Perſons of forty in his own Party do believe him. They plainly ſee, that if one Infinite and abſolutely Perfect Being, Mind or Spirit, be one abſolutely Perfect God, as all both Philoſophers and Divines confeſs he is; then of neceſſity, Three ſuch Beings are Three Gods: and Mutual Conſciouſneſs may make them a Cabal or Council of Gods; but never numerically One God. The Learned of his own Party know, that this Opinion of Dr. *Sherlock*, is the Errour or Hereſy of *Abbat Joachim*, condemned in the fourth General Council of *Lattran*, Anno 1215.

The next is Dr. *Wallis*, who has been ſtudying this Point, *above Forty, and towards Fifty Years*; as himſelf ſaith, *Letter 4. pag. 18.* After ſo long Conſideration, He is not pleaſed with former Explications; but advances one that is equally *New* and *Cautious*. 'The 'bleſſed Trinity is (ſaith he, *Lett. 2. pag. 3.*) '*three Somewhats*; and theſe three Somewhats 'we commonly call *Perſons*: but the true 'Notion and true Name of that Diſtinction, 'is unknown to us. He again owns this to be the true Senſe of his firſt Letter, at *pag. 8.* of the Second; and often in his following Letters. We may call this Explication, *Dr. W's Three New Nothings*: for three Somewhats, that have neither true Notion nor true Name, are to Us and to Him alſo, but ſo many Nothings; or rather *Somewhats leſs than Nothings*, for Nothing has at leaſt a Name.

It is plain, Dr. *Wallis* ſpake after this manner, only to avoid the Inexplicable Difficulties and Exceptions, to which (he ſaw) former Explications of the Word *Trinity*, were liable. And if he had gone no farther in his

his Attempts, upon this Subject; the *clamorous Socinians* (as he calls them) would not have charged his Doctrine, with *Impoſſibility* or *Inconſiſtency*. But in his Third Letter he has ſo deſcribed theſe *Somewhats*, or *Perſons without Notion or Name*; as to involve himſelf in Labyrinths, out of which all the Metaphyſicks of which he is Maſter, will never lead him.

He ſaith, *Lett.* 3. *pag.* 39. 'Theſe Somewhats, till my Anſwerer can furniſh us 'with a better Name, we are content to call '*Perſons*; which is *the Scripture Word* at 'Heb. 1. 3. But I deny, that *Perſons* is uſed of God, either in that Text, or elſewhere in Holy Scripture. The Scripture-Word every where is *Perſon*. In the Text by him alledged, the Son is ſaid to be the Image of *God's Perſon*; therefore God is but One Perſon: and therefore theſe (pretended) *Somewhats* muſt not be called *Perſons*; becauſe this is not only, not the Scripture-Word, as the Doctor unwarily ſaid, but is contrary to Scripture.

He ſaith, in the Letter and Page laſt quoted, 'The Word *Perſons* (when applied to 'God) is but Metaphorical; not ſignifying 'juſt the ſame, as when applied to Men. And again at *Lett.* 3. *pag.* 31. 'We mean 'thereby, no more but ſomewhat analogous 'to *Perſons*. He repeats both theſe, very often in his Letters. Now this is to ſay, that what we call Perſons in God, are not indeed Perſons, not *truly* or *properly* Perſons; but ſomewhat there is in God, we know not what, which in ſome regard anſwers to Perſons. It had been tolerable, tho not intelligible; if the Doctor had here held his Hand: but in his Explication of the *Athanaſian* Creed, where it was neceſſary to be ſomewhat Orthodox, he is in a contrary Story. For he ſays (*Lett.* 3. *pag.* 13.) *The Three* (οἱ τρεῖς) *are* (σῶμα ὑπόστασις) *truly Perſons*, or *properly Perſons*. And at *pag.* 66. of the ſame Letter, he approves of that *as the better Reading, and clearer Senſe*.

What a Task has he impoſed upon us? We muſt believe *a Trinity of Somewhats*. For Peace ſake, we are content to be Fools, and believe *we know not what*. But will this do? No: you muſt believe theſe *Somewhats* are *Perſons*. But the Scripture is againſt it. No, no; for this Diſtinction of Perſons, *has neither true Notion, nor true Name*. Upon this condition, we are contented: for if the Diſtinction has neither true Name, nor true Notion; we may affix a Notion and a Name *by way of Explication*, which may agree to the Deſcriptions of God in Scripture, eſpecially with that in the Firſt Commandment. Is all done now? There is one thing behind; but 'tis only this; 'You muſt believe the *Some-* 'whats to be but Metaphorical Perſons, 'ſomewhat Analogous or *like to* Perſons, '*not truly and properly* Perſons; and alſo, that '*they are truly Perſons and properly Perſons*. The Doctor will not deny this is worſe than *Egyptian* Slavery, of making Brick without Straw; for that was only hard, not impoſſible. And I cannot think the Doctor is ſo rigid, but that upon this Remonſtrance to him, he will diſcharge us of believing his Explications, which he muſt needs own to be contradictory, and therefore impoſſible to be believed.

It is evident to me, that Dr. *Wallis* has thought but very ſlightly (tho, it ſeems, very long) of the Trinity. For afterwards, he retracts this laſt, that the Somewhats are truly and properly Perſons; and explains them to be Three *ſuch* Perſons, as the *Sabellians* anciently, and now the *Socinians*, never oppoſed, but are ready to admit. *Letter* 3. *pag.* 4. He ſays; 'Henry, *William*, *Naſſau*, 'is but one Man, and one Husband. *James*, '*Duke*, *Marquiſs*, and *Earl* of *Ormond*, is not 'three Men, or three Chancellors. By theſe Compariſons, the three Perſons are but three *Names* or *Titles* of God, as the *Sabellians* held; and being rightly explained, the *Socinians* do not deny. But he goes on. 'Tully ſays, '*Suſtinto unus tres perſonas*; i. e. *I being but* 'one Man, do ſuſtain three Perſons: that of my 'Self, that of my Adverſary, and that of a 'Judge. He did not become three Men, by 'ſuſtaining three Perſons.——If among us, 'one Man may ſuſtain three Perſons, with-

' out being three Men: why ſhould it be ' thought incredible, that the three Divine ' Perſons may be one God, as well as *three other Perſons* be but one Man? Again at pag. 62. of the ſame Letter; ' The ſame ' Man may be ſaid to ſuſtain divers Perſons, ' and theſe Perſons to be the ſame Man, that ' is, the ſame Man *as ſuſtaining divers Capacities*: as was ſaid but now of *Tully*, *Ives perſonas unus ſuſtinet*. And then it will be no ' more harſh, to ſay the Three Perſons ' (Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt) are but ' one God; than to ſay, God the Creator, ' God the Redeemer, and God the Sanctifier, ' are (*He ſhould have ſaid*, is) but one God.— ' It is much the ſame thing, whether of theſe ' two Forms we uſe.—A King and an Huſ- ' band (tho they imply very different *Notions*, different *Capacities*, different *Relations*, ' or different *Perſonalities*) yet may both ' concur in the ſame Man. So alſo a King ' and a Father, a King and a Brother. Again, *Lett.* 4. *pag.* 25. ' We ſay; God ' the Creator, God the Redeemer, and God ' the Sanctifier (or in other Words, the Fa- ' ther, Son, and Holy Ghoſt) are this one ' God. At *pag.* 33. of the ſame Letter, he maketh a different *Perſon* to be only a different *Conſideration* or Reſpect; and in the next Page, not a Thing, but only *a Mode*. Now how can he, who believes ſuch a Trinity of *Somewhats* or Perſons, as this is, write againſt the *Socinians*? They believe this Trinity, as much as Dr. *Wallis*. They allow, there are in God three Somewhats and Perſons; meaning thereby, as Dr. *Wallis* explains them, three *Names* or *Titles*, three *Capacities* or *Reſpects*, three *Relations*, three *Conſiderations*, three *Notions*, three *Modes*. They believe, there are in God theſe three Modes, Notions, Conſiderations, Capacities, Names or Titles; *God the Creator*, *God the Redeemer*, *God the Sanctifier*.

If this be Dr. *Wallis* his *Abiding* Sentiment, concerning the Trinity; then if it be below his Character and Dignity, to permit himſelf to be called a *Sabellian*, or a *Socinian*; the *Socinians* and *Sabellians*, in honour of him, are content to be called *Wallifians*. And if you ask a *Sabellian*, How God the Creator, the Redeemer, and the Sanctifier, may be called God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit? He will anſwer; Almighty God as Creator is called the Father, or God the Father, becauſe by Creation he is Father of all things: as the Redeemer, he is called the Son, or God the Son, becauſe he redeemed us by his Son the Lord Chriſt: as the Sanctifier, he is called God the Holy Spirit, becauſe he ſanctifies us by his *Afflatus* or Inſpiration. The *Socinians* do think this is an harſh way of ſpeaking, yet for Peace ſake they would admit this Explication.

The Doctor's Explication of the Athanaſian *Creed, conſider'd.*

IT was with great expectation, that I began to read Dr. *Wallis* his third Letter; becauſe it bears this ambitious Front, *An Explication and Vindication of the Athanaſian Creed*. I ſuppoſed, He would attempt to aſſoil all the Difficulties and Contradictions, objected to it; at leaſt, thoſe in *the Brief Notes* on that Creed. But he meant no more by this Title, but this; *An Explication of the Damnatory Clauſes, in the Athanaſian Creed*. This was to me a wonderful Diſappointment. However, I will be content *to conſider*, what Dr. *Wallis* thought worthy *to offer*. He ſaith *Lett.* 3. *pag.* 4. ' *Whoſoever will be ſaved*; ' *before all things, it is neceſſary, that he hold* ' *the Catholick Faith*. Where, ſaith the ' Doctor, *before all things*, is as much as *in- primis*; importing, that it is *mainly neceſſary*, ' or *is a principal Requiſite*. Was there ever a greater force put upon words? *'Tis before all things*.

things necessary, saith the Creed; that is, saith the Gloss, *Tis a principal Requisite.* I always thought, there had been an immense difference, between *Necessary* and *Requisite*: and that abundance of Things had been *mainly* or principally *requisite*, which yet were not indispensably or *before all Things necessary*. But which of these *Athanasius* means, the next Clause puts out of question.

Which Faith, saith the Creed, *except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.* The Grammatical and obvious Sense of these words, is this; 'That Man or Woman shall perish everlast-'ingly, who doth not believe and profess 'this (following) Faith, which is indeed 'the Catholic or Universal Faith; without 'taking ought from it, or adding ought to 'it. No, says Dr. *Wallis*; the Greek word is not ὅλων *totam* or *whole*, but σῶον *salvam sanamve sound* or *safe*. And says he, farther; 'As a Man may be said to be *sound and safe*, 'notwithstanding a Wart or Wen; or even 'a Wound or a Maim; so long as the Vi-'tals are not indangered: So the Catholic 'Faith is *sound and safe*, so long as there is 'nothing destructive of the main Substan-'tials or Fundamentals. This is a marvel-lous reasoning, and such as the Doctor will very hardly perswade any to believe it. Is a Man *safe and sound*, when his Legs and Arms are shot off; so long as the Vitals are not indangered, but intire and safe? God deliver me, and Dr. *Wallis* too, from such Soundness and Safeness. And if the Catholic Faith is *sound* too, as he says, so long as the Substantials and Fundamentals remain; it will follow, that the Faith of the Church of *Rome* is *sound*. For all Protestants, but the *Socinians*, grant; that Church retains *all the Substantials and Fundamentals*: yet her Faith, they confess, is unsound; because of *the erroneous Additions* to the Substantials and Fundamentals. The Doctor therefore shall do well, to think again of this part of his Explication. But whereas he would confirm these Perversions, of the true intention of the damning Clauses in this Creed, by criticizing on the word σῶον; *I must plainly tell him*, he is *grossly out* in his Criticism. 'Tis not, says he, ὅλον *totum*, or *whole*, but 'σῶον, *salvum, sanum, sound* or *safe*. Is not σῶος indeed the same with ὅλος? If he pleases to consult his Lexicons, he will find that σῶος is rendred *integrum, perfectum, whole* or *perfect*: so that the sense of this Article, is, That Faith must be kept *perfect, whole* or entire; nothing must be added to it, nothing taken from it.

Lett. 3. *pag.* 8. 'And the *Catholic Faith* is 'this; that is, this is one main Part of the 'Catholic Faith. I confess, at this rate of expounding, a very tolerable Sense may be made of this Creed, and of the *Athanas.* If *before all Things, necessary* is only, *mainly requisite*: if *whole and undefiled* may be true of a Faith, which is neither whole nor undefiled; but sound only in Fundamentals: if *the Catholic Faith* is only *part of the Catholic Faith*: what Creed or Book may not be expounded to a sound Sense?

Lett. 3. *pag.* 11. 'The *Holy Ghost is of the* 'Father and of the Son; *neither Made, nor Be-*'gotten, *but Proceeding.* Here is no Ana-'thematizing of the Greek Church. 'Tis 'said indeed, *he doth proceed*, and so say 'they: but not that he doth proceed from 'the Father *and the Son.* And it is said he 'is *of* the Father and *of* the Son: but whe-'ther *by Procession* from both; or, if so, 'whether *in the same manner*, is not said, 'but warily avoided. —— And those who 'are better acquainted with the Doctrine 'and Languages of the present Greek Chur-'ches, than most of us are, do assure us, 'that the Differences between them and us, 'are rather in some Forms of Expressions, 'than in the Thing it self. To this I answer: The Doctor had as much reason to deny, that in this Article the Spirit is said to proceed from the Father, as from the Son. For the word *Proceeding* is so placed, both in the Greek and English as to refer to both, or to neither. Besides, *Proceeding* is (he knows) the very Characteristic of the Spirit; so that if he is *of* or *from* the Fa-

ther and the Son (which, the Doctor will not deny, is expreſly affirmed in this Article) it muſt be *by proceeding from them:* which ſince the Greeks deny, 'tis manifeſt their Doctrine is here condemned. What he adds of the preſent Greek Churches is not true: 'tis certain they hold, that their Doctrine is condemned in this Article; and therefore in return to *Athanaſius* his Complement, that *they ſhall periſh everlaſtingly*, they pleaſantly anſwer, *He was drunk when he made this Creed.*

The Athanaſian Creed has this Concluſion; *This is the Catholic Faith, which except a Man keep faithfully, he cannot be ſaved.* How can Dr. *Wallis* elude theſe plain words; which are not annexed to any Generals, as he (though untruly) ſays of the other Damnatory Clauſes, but are as it were the Label and Seal, affixed to the whole Creed at the end or bottom of it? But what cannot a Wit, and a Learned Man do; at leaſt, what will he not attempt? He gives us a large Interpretation of this Clauſe, at *pag.* 19. of his third Letter: but the ſumm of it is this: *This is the Catholic Faith*, i. e. this is *part of* that Faith, which all Chriſtians do and ought to believe. *Which Faith except a Man keep faithfully, he cannot be ſaved*, i. e. which Faith except a Man truly believe it, *as to the Subſtantials of it*, though poſſibly he may be ignorant of *many particulars thereof*, he cannot be ſaved: Which is, as if the Doctor had ſaid: 'Whereas the Athanaſian Creed concludes, with theſe formidable and *ſeemingly plain* words; *This* (before related) *is the Catholic Faith, which except a Man keep faithfully, he cannot be ſaved: Athanaſius* meant nothing leſs, than to damn all thoſe, who do not intirely believe his Creed. No, no, *that good Man* intended only this. This Catholic Faith is *part* of the Catholic Faith; and if you would be ſaved, you muſt believe this *part of the* Catholic Faith, *in part*, in the *Subſtantials* of it. Which Subſtantials, as I ſaid before, are only theſe two Generals; that *there is a Trinity in Unity*, or three Somewhats in one God; and that *Chriſt was Incarnate.* This laſt may moſt eaſily be received by all Parties; for all Souls are Incarnate; and Partakers of Fleſh and Blood, by Incarnation or Incorporation. I leave it with the Reader to judge, whether the Doctor has interpreted, or eluded this Creed.

I believe, Dr. *Wallis* had a charitable Intention, in the pains he has taken, to find out a favourable Senſe of the words of this Creed. But on the other hand, it looks not well, that he ſhould put as great a force on the words of *Socinus*, to make him ſpeak impiouſly and heretically, as he has on the words of *Athanaſius*, to make him ſpeak Orthodoxly or Charitably. This is the next thing I will conſider in his Letters.

The Opinions charged on Socinus, *and the* Socinians.

IN his firſt, third and fourth Letters, He has charged the *Socinians* with Opinions; which not only ſubvert the Authority and Belief of Holy Scripture, but indanger all Religion and Piety towards God. *Lett.* 4. *pag.* 3. He ſaith that, *He taketh his whole charge againſt the* Socinians, *as granted.* He adds, at *pag.* 5. of the ſame Letter, that, 'There is reaſon to ſuſpect, that the *Socinians* have ſome other odd Tenents; which 'they think fit rather to *conceal* than to *deny.* What thoſe odd Tenents are, he tells us, at *Lett.* 1. *pag.* 16. that, 'There is neither Angel nor Spirit; that, the Holy 'Scriptures are not the Word of God, nor 'yet the Doctrines therein contained. He there gives his reaſon, why he ſuſpects, and would have others ſuſpect them of theſe horrid

rid Opinions. ‘ Becauſe they ſpare not to ‘ let us know, that were this Doctrine of ‘ the Trinity delivered in Scripture, in words ‘ as expreſs as could be, they would not ‘ believe it. There can be nothing more ſalſe, or diſingenuous, than this Charge. I will examine it, Part by Part; and the (perverted) Quotations, by which he would prove it to the Unlearned Reader.

Lett. 1. *pag.* 5. ‘ They (*the Socinians*) tell ‘ us; How clear ſoever the Expreſſions of ‘ Scripture *be*, or *can be*, to this purpoſe, ‘ (i. e. *to prove the Doctrine of the Trinity*) they ‘ will not believe it; becauſe inconſiſtent ‘ with natural Reaſon. The Doctor very often in theſe Letters, makes it a great and inexcuſeable Crime in the *Socinians*, that becauſe the Trinity is inconſiſtent with Natural Reaſon, therefore they will not believe it, even though it were expreſſed in Scripture. But what if the *Trinitarians* themſelves are of this opinion; that, what is inconſiſtent with Natural Reaſon, or with our common and congennit Notions, is not to be believed, though the words of Scripture be never ſo expreſs? Dr. *Sherlock* ſure is (*now*) no *Socinian*, but a *Trinitarian*; yet at *pag.* 151. of his late *Anſwer* to the *Brief Hiſtory*, and *Brief Notes*, he puts in his own Name this Queſtion, and anſwer to it. ‘ Suppoſe, that ‘ the natural Conſtruction of the words (*of* ‘ *Scripture*) import ſuch a ſenſe, as is contrary to ſome evident Principle of Reaſon? ‘ Then I won't believe it. How, not believe Scripture? No, no, I will believe no ‘ pretended Revelation, which contradicts ‘ the plain Dictates of Reaſon. The Profeſſors of *Franeker*, who are not *Socinians*, (as the Doctor miſtakes, *Lett.* 3. *pag.* 38.) but *Trinitarians* of the moſt rigid Sect; for they are *Calviniſts* of the cut and die of the *Dort* Synod; and otherways could not be in the Penſion of *the States* of the *United Provinces*: thoſe Profeſſors, I ſay, by confeſſion of Dr. *Wallis*, publiſhed a Theſis to this effect: ‘ If Reaſon dictates to us any thing o‘ therwiſe, than the Scripture does; 'tis an ‘ errour to ſay, in ſuch caſe, we are rather ‘ to believe the Scripture. 'Tis no new thing, that Writers who undertake to diſcuſs Queſtions which they do not thorowly underſtand, ſhould frequently and very *groſly* contradict themſelves. Dr. *Wallis* himſelf is in this very overſight. While he is warmly charging the *Socinians*, with Sadduciſm and Impiety, for affirming (as he untruly ſays) that, they would not believe what is contained in Scripture, if contrary to Reaſon: while I ſay he is charging the *Socinians* with this Doctrine, as an impious and unchriſtian Opinion; he himſelf not only believes, but profeſſes it. *Lett.* 1. *pag.* 8. ‘ In this caſe (*the Queſtion* ‘ *of the Trinity*) the Revelation ſeems ſo clear ‘ (to thoſe who believe the Scripture) that ‘ we have no reaſon to doubt of it; unleſs ‘ the thing be found really impoſſible, and ‘ inconſiſtent with Reaſon. What is this but to ſay; Though Revelation be moſt clear, yet if the thing be impoſſible, and inconſiſtent with Reaſon, we have reaſon enough to doubt of it? Would Dr. *Wallis* now be content, that his Reader ſhould infer from hence, that he is a *Sadducee*, believing neither Angel nor Spirit; or an *Atheiſt*, or at leaſt a *Deiſt*, not believing the Scripture, or that the Doctrines thereof are the Word of God; as he, moſt raſhly, and moſt uncharitably, has intimated concerning the *Socinians*?

In my former Anſwer to him, I oppoſed to this charge of the Doctor, the clear words of *Socinus*, of *Sclichtingius*, and of *Smalcius*. The firſt of theſe ſays; ‘ The way of Reaſon is too fallible, in a Matter depending ‘ on Divine Revelation; ſuch as the Chriſtian ‘ Religion is. The ſecond ſays; ‘ If any ‘ thing appear to be contained in Scripture; ‘ whatever Reaſon may ſay in contradiction ‘ to it, Reaſon muſt of neceſſity be de‘ ceived. The third ſays; ‘ Religion and ‘ Holy Scripture have many things above ‘ Reaſon, and therein they highly commend ‘ themſelves; but nothing which is contrary ‘ to Reaſon. As a ſmall Light to a great ‘ one, ſo Reaſon is not contrary to Scripture. Let *Frantzius* tell us of any one Sen‘ tence

' tence of Scripture, which is contrary to ' Reason; and then let Reason be silent in the ' Church. *Socinus* de Author S. Scrip. *p.* 16. *Schlichtingius* adv. Meisn. de S. Trin. *p.* 68. *Smalcius* contr. *Frantz.* disp. 4. *p.* 137.

To these Citations Dr. *Wallis* answers; ' He tells me of some *Socinians*, who have ' so much respect for the Scriptures as to ' say, Scripture contains nothing repugnant ' to Reason, and what doth not agree with ' Reason, hath no place in Divinity. Since the Doctor is not pleased to observe what my Quotations prove; I must desire our Reader to observe, and to judge between us. I think they clear the *Socinians* of the scandalous Imputation, which the Doctor seeks to fasten on them.

Lett. 3. *pag.* 45. ' As to the suspicion I had ' of some of their Sentiments: *Socinus* (E- ' pist. 5. *ad Volkel.*) doth absolutely *deny*, ' that *the Soul after Death* doth subsist. But let us hear the words of *Socinus*, not as they are dockt by this Author, but as they are in that Epistle. *Satis apparet me sentire, non ITA vivere post hominis ipsius mortem, animam ejus; at PER SE præmiorum pœnarumve capax existat; cum in ipso primo homine, totius Immortalitatis rationem, uni Gratiæ Dei tribuam*, i. e. ' I hold, that a Man's Soul after ' his Death doth not *so* live, as that by it ' self, or *of its own Nature*, 'tis capable of ' Reward or Punishment. In the very first ' Man, I attribute his Immortality to the ' alone Grace of God. In a word, the O- pinion of *Socinus* was this, That there is no *Natural* Immortality in Man, but *he hath it by the Grace and Gift of God.*

Lett. 3. *pag.* 46. ' *Socinus* in his Tract ' *de Eccl.* says thus; I am not to regard ' what other Men teach or think, or have ' before now taught or thought; whosoever ' or how many soever they be, or have been. ' And if, saith Dr. *Wallis*, *Whosoever* are not ' here to be extended to the Sacred Wri- ' ters; he tells us of them elsewhere. It appears, that the Doctor would have it thought, that these Words are meant of the Writers of Holy Scripture, as well as others; at least, that 'tis doubtful whether they were not so intended. Therefore here again we must hear *Socinus* himself. *Cumque res Divinas, Humana ipsa per se ratio assequi nequeat; ad Divinam satisfactionem eo fugiendum est. Nec attendandum quid Homines, præsertim quos nec vitæ Innocentia, nec Divinum aliquod certum Testimonium commendat, doceant sentiantve; vel antehac docuerint aut senserint; quicunque illi tandem aut quotcunque sint, aut fuerint. i. e.* ' Since Human Reason cannot of it self attain ' the knowledg of things Divine, *we must* ' *have recourse to Divine Revelation*; and not ' mind what Men (especially who are re- ' commended to us, neither by their own ' Piety, nor by the Witness of God) teach ' er think; or have taught or thought; ' whosoever, or how many soever they be, or ' have been. I know not what could be said more truly, or more like a Protestant.

Dr. W. *Lett.* 3. *pag.* 47. ' As for me (saith ' *Socinus, de Servat. pag.* 3. *c.* 6.) tho it were ' found written in the Sacred Monuments, ' not once, but many times; I would not for ' all that believe it so to be. And a little ' before, having first told us that the thing ' was *impossible*; He adds: When it doth ' plainly appear (*or when he thinks so, what- ' ever all the World think beside*) that the ' thing cannot be, tho the Divine Oracles do ' seem expressly to attest it, *it must not be ad- ' mitted*; and therefore the Sacred Words ' are, even by unusual Tropes, *to be interpreted* ' to another Sense than what they speak. To this *I* say, either *Socinus* was a gross Here- tick, or an Apostate from Christianity; or those who have furnished Dr. *Wallis* with these Quotations are as gross Falsifiers: for I can- not suspect, that Dr. *Wallis* himself would forge such Calumnies to blacken another Man, especially a Noble Person, long since dead, and who never did him any Injury. The ve- ry words of *Socinus* are these. *Nonnulla in ipso* (nempe Christo) *reperta sunt quæ ejusmo- di satisfactionem penitus excludant. Quæ nequeo satis mirari, quid eis in mentem venerit, qui nobis primi* Hanc *Satisfactionem fabricârunt. Cum ea quæ fieri non posse aperte constat, Divinis*

etiam

etiam oraculis ea facta fuisse in speciem *disertè attestantibus, nequaquam admittantur*; (*& idcirco sacra verba in alium sensum quam ipsa sonant, etiam per inusitatos tropos explicantur*;) *nedum tunc pro compertis & plane veris affirmentur, atque aliis obtrudantur, cum ne verbum quidem in universis sacris literis de ipsis extet. Nam si vel unus saltem locus inveniretur, in quo Satisfactionis, pro peccatis nostris Deo per Christum exhibitæ mentio fieret; excusandi fortasse viderentur. Ego quidem etiamsi, non semel sed, sæpe ID in sacris monumentis scriptum extaret; non idcirco tamen ita rem prorsus se habere crederem, ut vos opinamini.* In English, thus; ' There are some ' things in our Lord Christ, which plainly exclude *such a* Satisfaction. Wherefore ' I cannot sufficiently wonder, what was in ' their Minds, who first devised *that* Satisfaction. Those things, of which 'tis manifest that they cannot be, are not admitted (*he means, by Interpreters and Commentators*) ' though the Scriptures do *as it were seem* to ' affirm them expresly; (and therefore the ' sacred Words are, even by unusual Tropes, ' interpreted to another sense than what ' they sound;) much less are they affirmed ' for apparent and plain Truths, or forced upon others, when there is not a word about ' them in the whole Scripture. For if even ' but one Text were found, in which there ' were mention of Satisfaction, made to ' God for our Sins by the Lord Christ; they ' might perhaps be excused. For my part, ' though *IT* (*he means this word Satisfaction*) ' were extant in Scripture, not only once, ' but many times; I would not for all that, ' believe *the Thing* to be altogether *so as ye* ' *hold it*. These last words are left out in the Doctor's Latin Quotation, and in his Translation; and what *Socinus* plainly intended of the custom and manner of Interpreters or Commentators, that the Doctor represents as *Socinus* his private Sentiment, and the rule of interpreting by him only used and advised. But any one who understands Latin, and reads *Socinus* his own words at length, which I have before repeated, will see, *Socinus* meant only thus much: ' This ' word *Satisfaction* is no where extant in ' Holy Scripture; and if it were, yet we ' need not therefore believe the vulgar ' Doctrine about the Satisfaction; both because there are in the Lord Christ himself ' several things which exclude such a Satisfaction; and because all Interpreters have ' recourse to (even unusual) Tropes, when ' the Scriptures seem to affirm things which ' would be manifestly false, if we interpreted ' them by the mear sound of the Words. I suppose *Socinus* might have in his Thoughts, *that Rock was Christ*, 1 Cor. 10. 4. *I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven, if any Man eat of this Bread he shall live for ever*; or such like Texts: in which it cannot be denied, that the Tropes are harsh and unusual in the Western Languages, though they were not so in the Eastern.

Lett. 3. *pag.* 4. ' They are *Socinus* his ' own words (Epist. *ad Balcerovic. Jan.* 30. ' 1581.) The contrary Opinion (with *Augustin*'s leave, and others of his mind) seems ' to me so absurd and pernicious; that we ' must rather put *a Force, how great soever*, ' upon *Paul*'s words, than admit it. At *Lett.* 4. *pag.* 2. and often elsewhere, the Doctor repeats these words as if they were spoken of the Doctrine of the Trinity. But the thing is not so. The Question touched in that Letter, is whether the Context of *Rom.* 7. 14, *&c. I am Carnal, sold under Sin*, &c. is to be understood of *Paul* himself, and every other regenerate Person, or not? *Socinus* denies, they are spoken of *Paul*, or other regenerate Person, and adds that a Force (how great soever) is rather to be used to the words, than to admit such a pernicious Opinion; that is, than admit that St. *Paul* or a regenerate Man is *Carnal, sold under Sin*, &c. These words are indeed *hyperbolical*; but considering the occasion, capable of (and intended in) an honest sense; as any candid Man will acknowledg.

Lett. 3. *pag.* 44. He saith; ' *Sandius*, that ' great Friend of the *Socinians*, and Promoter of their Cause, published a Thesis against the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, and

' was

was ſo anſwered by *Wittichius*, that a Friend of *Sandius* (and his Partner in maintaining that Theſis) did after the Death of *Sandius* publiſh to the World, that *Sandius* himſelf was ſatisfied, and changed his Opinion. This Matter is both unskilfully and unfairly related. Firſt, *Sandius* was no *Socinian*, but an *Arian*; and not only often wrote againſt the *Socinians*, but endeavours in that very Theſis (mentioned by the Doctor) to confute the Opinion of the *Socinians* about the Holy Ghoſt. Secondly, As *Sandius* denied *the Divinity* and believed *the Perſonality* of the Holy Spirit; ſo it came into his Mind, that perhaps by the Holy Spirit is meant the whole kind of Holy Angels or Spirits; as by the Devil and Satan, is often meant the whole Race of wicked, apoſtate or fallen Spirits. This Opinion he calls a Paradox, *Problema*, *Paradoxum*, and propounds it to be diſputed by Learned Men; himſelf alledging the Arguments for it in the aforementioned Theſis. *Wittichius* ſo replied, that (as *Sandius* his Aſſociate reports) *Sandius* was ſatisfied, not of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, but that the Spirit is One Perſon, (as the *Arians* always held) not more Perſons or Spirits.

I ſaid in my former Letter, that a Reſpondent for his Degree at *Oxford*, put for one of his Queſtions, ſuch a Theſis againſt the *Socinians*, as Dr. *Wallis* objects to them, *viz.* That they preferred Reaſon above Scripture; and that his Learned *Antagoniſt* (thô neither then, nor ſince a *Socinian*) made it appear that the Reſpondent had not read the Books of the *Socinians*, but accuſed them *by hearſay*. I added, That if Dr. *Wallis* were urged to defend his Charge againſt the *Socinians*; I doubted, he could acquit himſelf no better than that Capdidate for *his Degree* did. The Doctor has increaſed my Suſpicion by his third and fourth Letters; for I cannot believe of him, that he would knowingly and deliberately pervert the Words of Authors, long ſince dead, and who never did him wrong by Word or Deed. Therefore I ſuppoſe his Quotations were borrowed from S. *Mareſius* (or perhaps from S. *Lubbertus*) who cared not what he ſaid of any Adverſary, eſpecially of a *Remonſtrant* or a *Socinian*. But were this whole Accuſation of *Socinus* as true as 'tis notoriouſly falſe; the *Unitarians* (though they are by others called *Socinians*) do not think themſelves concerned in it: for they do not profeſs to follow *Socinus*, but the Scripture. If *Socinus* has at any time ſpoken erroneouſly, or unadviſedly, or hyperbolically; 'tis not *Socinus* who is their Maſter, but Chriſt. As great *Chillingworth* ſomewhere ſays, the Bible, the Bible, the Bible, is our both Rule, and Guide: not *Calvin*, not *Luther*, nor *Socinus*, but the Bible.

I am come now within ſight of my Concluſion; it only remains, that I anſwer briefly to ſome exceptionable Paſſages, and incompetent Anſwers, to what I had objected in my firſt Letter. I may be *very brief*, becauſe the Doctor, as is the cuſtom of eloquent Men and Orators, has ſaid but *a little in a great deal*.

Firſt; Whereas he has up and down in theſe Letters, objected ſeveral Texts againſt the Socinian Hereſy of *but One God*; and in defence of the Catholic and Orthodox Doctrine of *Three Gods*: as to thoſe Texts which he has only cited, without inlarging or criticizing upon them, I refer my ſelf to the Explications in the *Brief Hiſtory* of the *Socinians*, and to *the Defence* of that Hiſtory. He ſaith (*Lett. 3. pag. 42.*) that Dr. *Sherlock has confuted that Hiſtory*. I obſerve, that the Orthodox Writers cry up one anothers Books, as clear Victories; though thoſe Books are as contrary to one another as they are to the *Socinians*; and if any one of them has confuted the *Socinians*, he has at the ſame time confuted all his own Party, and even Holy-mother *Church* her ſelf. If Dr. *Sherlock* has confuted the *Brief Hiſtory*, he muſt needs too have confuted Dr. *Wallis* his four *Sabellian Letters*. If he has proved, that there are Three Infinite Intelligent Beings, Minds, and Spirits, then he has confuted thoſe that ſay, the Trinity is *Three Somewhats, without true Name, or true Notion*; Three Capa-

Capacities or Reſpects, Three Names or Titles of God, Three Modes or Relations to his Creatures, namely Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. And if Dr. *Wallis* has proved this laſt in his celebrated Letter, he has without doubt confuted Dr. *Sherlock*; who aſſerts Three Infinite Spirits and Beings; who are one God, only as they are Mutually Conſcious, or know and feel one anothers Minds and Actions. And both of them have confuted Mother *Church*, who hath in ſeveral General Councils Anathematized the Doctrine of *Sabellius*, whom Dr. *Wallis* follows; and the Hereſy of *Philoponus* and *Abbat Joachim*, who are followed by Dr. *Sherlock*. That a *Sabellian* ſhould tell a *Tritheiſt*, he has confuted the *Socinians*, is ſuch a Complement, that if *the Vindicator* doth not take it for a Jeer, he is (without doubt) ſo much a Gentleman, as by way of requital to publiſh to the World in his Next, that Dr. *Wallis* has eternally and irrefragably *confuted the Neighbour, and the Neighbour's Friend.*

In the mean time, I cannot but wonder, that the Orthodox Writers being ſo badly agreed, what their Trinity is, that they have nothing left in common among them but only the word *Trinity*: I wonder, (I ſay) that they ſhould ſo earneſtly contend for a Word, which themſelves confeſs, is neither found in Scripture, nor was known to firſt and pure Antiquity. The two great Reformers, *Luther* and *Calvin*, were not ſo much taken with this Word, as we are now adays. *M. Luther* (*Poſtil. major. Dominic.*) ſays; 'The word 'Trinity ſounds odly, and is an humane In-'vention. It were better to call Almighty 'God, *God*, than *Trinity*. *J. Calvin* (*Admon. 1. ad Polonos*) ſays; 'I like not this 'Prayer, *O Holy Bleſſed and Glorious Trinity.* 'It ſavours of Barbarity; —— the word 'Trinity is barbarous, inſipid, profane, an 'humane Invention, grounded on no Teſti-'mony of God's Word, the Popiſh God, 'unknown to the Prophets and Apoſtles.

I obſerved in my former Letter, that our Saviour ſays, *John* 17. 1, 3. *Father, — this is Life eternal, that they know Thee (the only true God) and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.* Or, Jeſus Chriſt thy Meſſenger. I alledged this Text to prove, that only *the Father* is the true God. The Doctor (at *Lett.* 3. *pag.* 51.) gives three Anſwers. And of theſe, the firſt and third are contrary to and deſtructive of one another; if the firſt is true, the third muſt be falſe; if the third be true, the firſt is falſe. For the firſt ſuppoſes, that by *Father* here is meant only the Perſon of the Father, or the firſt Perſon in the Trinity; the other ſuppoſes, that by *Father* is meant *God* in the moſt large ſenſe; ſo as to comprize the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. I will examine the three Anſwers ſeverally.

1. He ſaith; 'I ſhould have conſidered, 'that it is not ſaid, *Thee only*, to be the true 'God; but *Thee*, the only true God. The 'reſtrictive *Only* is not annexed to *Thee*, but 'to *God*. His meaning in plainer terms is this; I ſhould have noted the vaſt difference between theſe two Forms, *Thee only, the true God*; and, *Thee, the only true God*. If the objected Text had been in the firſt of theſe Forms, the *Socinians* had undoubtedly gained their Point; but the latter (which is the Form in the alledged Text) does them no ſervice. This may be called a Fineneſs, a Subtlety, a Querk; not an Accurate Reaſoning, or a real and true Diſtinction. For, firſt; There is no difference in the Signification of theſe Propoſitions: *Thee only, the true God*; and, *Thee, the only true God:* the laſt is as excluſive of all other Perſons beſides the Father, as the firſt. As there is no difference between ſaying, *Thee only*, Leopold, *the true Emperour of* Germany: and ſaying, *Thee*, Leopold, *the only true Emperour of* Germany. Secondly, If there were indeed a difference between theſe two Forms, yet the latter is as hurtful to the *Trinitarians* as the former. They will not have it to be here ſaid, *the Father only is the true God*; no, no, that deſtroys the Trinity: but, *the Father is the only true God.* I ſay now, if this laſt does not deſtroy the Trinity, it certainly *confounds the Perſons*, which in their Creed is no leſs Hereſy than the o-

ther. For seeing in the Trinitarian Hypothesis, God or the One true God is Father, Son, and Holy Sprit; these words, *Thee Father the only true God*, must be to say, *Thee Father, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*. But this is Heresy, it confounds the Persons; it makes the Father, to be Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Thus the Doctor's first Answer has two Faults; 'tis founded not on a real, but chimerical and imaginary Distinction; and it implies Heresy.

2. He answers; 'The words may be thus 'expounded. To know Thee, Father, to 'be the only true God, and Jesus Christ, 'whom thou hast sent. Or thus, to know Thee, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent, to be the only true God. This Interpretation is generally rejected by the more Learned *Trinitarians*, because it apparently destroys the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. For if the Father and Son, be the only true God, it remains, that the Spirit either is only *a Creature*, as the *Arians* and *Bidellians* say; or the *Power and Inspiration of God*, as the *Photinians* and *Socinians* affirm. I believe the Doctor was aware of this unlucky Consequence, and therefore advanced a third Interpretation, which himself seems to approve, because afterwards he repeats and urges it again.

3. He says; 'The Scope of the place 'may be this; to set forth, that *there is but* 'One true God (though in this Godhead be 'Three Persons, Father, Son, and Spirit:) 'and the Doctrine of Redemption, by *Jesus* 'Christ whom God hath sent: Which Things 'the Heathens knew not. Now according to this Answer, *Father* in this Text is *God*, as comprizing the Three Persons, Father, Son, and Spirit; and Jesus Christ, is the Man Jesus Christ, or Jesus Christ as Man. But I would know how it comes to pass, that the particular Title and very Characteristic of the first Person, is here given to the Son and Spirit? At this rate of interpreting, how shall we ever distinguish the Persons? One while we are told, *Father* is the perpetual and incommunicable Character or Description of the First Person: another while, *Father* is the Three Persons, even Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. But so it is, They that maintain a false Opinion, must answer according to the present Exigence; sometimes this Thing, sometimes the contrary: only Truth is stable, coherent, consistent with it self, always the same. Farther, That by *Father* here is meant only One Person, not Three Persons, is clear by this, that otherways our Saviour should have said *Fathers*, not *Father*. For Three Persons, who All have the relation of Paternity (as this Answer supposes) are as much Three Fathers, as they are Three Persons.

Next, I objected 1 Cor. 8. 6. *But to us, there is but One God, the Father, of whom are all Things, and we in Him; and One Lord* (or Master, *i. e.* Teacher) *Jesus Christ, by whom are all Things, and we by Him.* Or rather, Jesus Christ, *for* whom are all Things, and we *for* Him. For all Things were originally created for Him; that is, with Intention to subject them (in the fulness of time) to Him, as their Principal and Head, under God. To this the Doctor answers as before; 'It is 'manifest, that *One God* is here put in op- 'position (not to Plurality of Persons in one 'Deity, but) to the *many Gods* of the Hea- 'then; and our *one* Saviour against their 'many Saviours. But I do not know, that the Heathens distinguished between their Gods and their Saviours, as the Doctor here and many other Interpreters suppose. He should have said, our one Master or *Teacher* to their many Teachers, to the numerous Professors of different Philosophies among the Heathen. But the *One God* is opposed, not only to the *Many Gods* of the Heathen, but to all other Persons, but (ὁ πατὴρ) *the Father*. I ask as before, How could St. *Paul* call Three Persons ὁ πατὴρ *the Father*; and how this Characteristic of the First Person can by him be given, to *the Son* and *the Preceder*: is not this plainly to *confound the Persons?* He that confounds *the Characters*, necessarily confounds the Persons. If the Apostle had known and believed the Divinity of our Times, he must have said; *To us there is*

but

but one God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt; and one Teacher, Jeſus Chriſt as Man. Nay were that Doctrine true, he had more reaſon ſo to ſpeak to the *Corinthians*, than we now have. For they were Novice Chriſtians, to whom it was neceſſary to ſpeak of ſo high a Point, in the moſt explicit open and plain Terms. We may therefore certainly infer, that when he teaches them, *To us there is but One God,* (ὁ πατὴρ) *the Father*; he meant to deny, that there is any other Perſon but the Father, who is or can be God.

Lett. 3. *pag.* 57. He objects, *Rom.* 9. 5. *Of whom as concerning the Fleſh Chriſt came, who is over all, God bleſſed for ever*; Amen. 'He 'obſerves hereupon, that in the Greek 'tis 'ὁ ὤν, which anſwers to *JAH* and *Jehovah*. 'And, that Chriſt is again called ὁ ὤν at *Rev.* '1. 8. as appears by ver. 11, 13, 17, 18. 'He ſaith farther, that the above-cited Text 'in its full Emphaſis, is thus; *Of whom as* 'concerning the Fleſh Chriſt came, that Being o-'ver all, the ever bleſſed God. Amen. But firſt, The word *Amen* makes Non-ſenſe of this whole Criticiſm and Tranſlation. If the Doctor had tranſlated this Text as *Eraſmus, Curcellæus*, and the *Socinians* do; *Of whom as concerning the Fleſh Chriſt came, God who is over all, be bleſſed for ever:* it had been proper for the Apoſtle to conclude ſuch a Doxology or *Thankſgiving*, with *Amen*. But 'tis Non-ſenſe to ſay *Amen*, to theſe words; *Of whom as concerning the Fleſh Chriſt came, that Being over all, the ever-bleſſed God.* Every one ſees here is no occaſion for *Amen*. But this Criticiſm and Interpretation of the Doctor, has another fault. For if, as the Doctor ſays, ὁ ὤν be *that Being over all*, and anſwers to the Hebrew *Jah* and *Jehovah*; and if Jeſus Chriſt be *that Being over all*, *Jah*, and *Jehovah*, the ever-bleſſed God, he muſt be Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: for according to the *Trinitarians*, ὁ ὤν *Jah Jehovah*, the Being over all, the ever-bleſſed God, is theſe Three Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. I ſay therefore, the Doctor's is not a good Tranſlation, becauſe Jeſus Chriſt is not Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. He ſaith, the Lord Chriſt is called ὁ ὤν at *Rev.* 1. 8. I deny it. And I give this reaſon; becauſe at *ver.* 5. Chriſt is diſtinguiſhed from, and oppoſed to ὁ ὤν, who is mentioned at *ver.* 4. He cannot be that Perſon or Thing from which he is diſtinguiſhed, and to which he is oppoſed; for Diſtinction and Oppoſition ſuppoſe that Perſons and Things are divers. But the Doctor ſaith, it appears by *ver.* 11, 13, 17, 18. that at *ver.* 8. the Lord Chriſt is called ὁ ὤν. He doubted his Reader would not believe him if he recited the Words, therefore he warily refers only to the Verſes. I deny, that in any of theſe Verſes the Lord Chriſt is called ὁ ὤν. And *ver.* 18. (one of the Verſes quoted by him) demonſtrates, that Jeſus Chriſt is not ὁ ὤν, the Being over All, the ever-bleſſed God. For there it is ſaid of him, *I am he that liveth, and was dead.* Doth it agree to ὁ ὤν, to Unchangeable *JAH*, to Immutable *Jehovah*, that BEING over All, the ever-bleſſed God; that he liveth, *and was dead?*

Lett. 1. *pag.* 2. He objected, 1 John 5. 7. *There are Three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt: and theſe Three are One.* I anſwered, 1. *They are one in their Teſtimony*; they witneſs the ſame thing: not one God. So *Calvin, Beza, Eraſmus, Vatablus*, and the *Engliſh-Geneva* Notes interpret. But the Doctor likes it not. He ſaith, 'Unum ſunt, they are One; and Unum ſumus '(at *John* 10. 30.) *We are One*, muſt ſignify 'one thing, one in Being, one in Eſſence. 'For ſo Adjectives of the Neuter Gender, 'without a Subſtantive, uſually ſignify both 'in *Greek* and *Latin*. Now I deſire him to give me but one Inſtance in any Author, Sacred or Profane, where Unum ſunt they are one, or Unum ſumus we are one, do ſignify (as he ſays) one in Being, one in Eſſence, or one numerical Thing. When our Saviour ſays (John 10. 30.) *I and the Father are One*, 'tis certain from his own Explication elſewhere, that he means not one numerical Thing, one in Being, one in Eſſence, or one God. He prays at John 17. 22.— *That they* (the Diſciples) *may be One, as We* (the Father and I) *are One.* This Paſſage tells us, how we

are

are to understand John 10. 30. *I and the Father are One.* For the Disciples could be no otherways One, but One in Design, Interest, and Affection. But they were to be one, as Christ and the Father are one: therefore the Unity of God and Christ, is an Oneness or Uniry of Affection, Design and Interest. Even as St. *Paul*, speaking of Himself and *Apollos*, says, 1 Cor. 3. 8. *He that planteth, and he that watereth, are one.* He meaneth one in Design; in the design of planting and propagating the Gospel. 2. I excepted against the Authority of this Text, because 'tis wanting in all the Ancient Translations, and all Manuscripts of Note. He makes light of this, and says, *Whole Epistles are wanting in some Copies.* 'Tis true, that, before Printing was in use, 'twas not very common to find the whole Bible in one Manuscript; for People generally wrote out for their use only such parts of the Bible as they most esteemed. Some had only the Four Gospels, some added the Epistles of St. *Paul*, some the Catholick Epistles. But whoever wrote out an entire Book, or Epistle, never presumed to add any thing to the Text, or to omit any thing. But the objected Text was in no Copy of the Bible, I mean, *in the Text* of such Copy, before St. *Jerom* brought it out of the Margin of some Copies. It was at first a Marginal Note, and by him made a part of the Sacred Text. It is never cited by any of the Fathers, till after his time. It is now indeed in St. *Cyprian*'s Book *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, but the Criticks have all noted, that no Credit is to be given to that Book, as we now have it. For in that little Tract of but Four Leaves, they observe 288 Alterations and Additions.

Lastly; The Doctor saith, ' ἓν ἐσμεν in this ' Text, and ἓν ἐσμεν at *John* 10. 30. agree so ' well; that 'tis a strong Presumption they ' are from the same Pen. But, 1. I observe, ἓν ἐσμεν are not the Words of St. *John* at *John* 10. 30. but of our Lord Christ; and I have already accounted for them. 2. If it be so strong a Presumption, that ἓν ἐσμεν, *They are one*, are indeed St. *John*'s Words, because we find ἓν ἐσμεν, *We are one*, in his Gospel: 'tis a much stronger Presumption, that they are St. *Paul*'s Words, because he hath the very Words ἓν ἐσμεν, *They are One*, 1 Cor. 3. 8.

Lett. 1. *pag.* 2. He saith, ' The Form of ' Baptism, (*Mat.* 28. 19.) is, *in the Name of* ' *the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.* He adds, *Lett.* 3. *pag.* 31. ' We are baptized ' to the joint Service and Worship of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and for ought ' appears, *in the same degree.* No, the contrary appears, because we know that the Son is but a Man, and the Spirit either an Angel, or the Power only and Inspiration of God. But for this matter I refer the Reader, and (if he pleases) the Doctor himself, to the *Brief History, pag.* 77, 78, 79. and to the *Defence of that History, pag.* 37, 38, 39, 40.

I am not aware, Sir, that there is any thing more in the Doctor's Letters necessary to be considered. I conclude therefore, with desiring you to give my Acknowledgments and Thanks to Dr. *Wallis*, that he was willing to spend some part of his time, which he knows how to expend so well, in seeking *to instruct* and reduce the *Unitarians*, and particularly the *Socinians*. That they are not convinced by what he hath said, doth not (they confess) lessen their Obligations to him. They desire it may not lessen his Charity to them; since 'tis not in Mens Power to believe as they will. They profess he has written like a Man of Wit and Letters; like a Gentleman, and like a Christian: Therefore they will always hear Dr. *Wallis* as a Father; and if there be a necessity at any time to reply, they will answer respectfully. Sir, I am Yours.

FINIS.